Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-88-106
Thursday
2 June 1988

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-88-106 *2 June 1988*

CONTENTS

INTRABLOC AFFAIRS

Socialist CC Secretaries Meet in Bucharest 1
CPCZ Delegation Arrives *[Prague]* 1
GDR's Felfe Leads Meeting *[ADN]* 1
CEMA Economic Conference Meets in Budapest 1
Delegations Arrive *[MTI]* 1
Hungarian Delegation Listed *[MTI]* 1
MSZMP, BCP Secretaries Speak *[MTI]* 1

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Pact Leaders at Third UN Disarmament Session 3
Fischer Opens Meeting *[ADN]* 3
Bulgarian Interviewed *[RABOTNICHESKO DELO 30 May]* 3

BULGARIA

Reagan Meeting With Dissidents Criticized *[NARODNA ARMIYA 31 May]* 6
Polish Leaders Greeted on Treaty Anniversary *[RABOTNICHESKO DELO 29 May]* 6
Mitkov Interviewed on Army BCP Conference *[RABOTNICHESKO DELO 26 May]* 7

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

RUDE PRAVO on U.S. President at Summit *[Jelinek, 30 May]* 9
Stepan Receives PRC Foreign Relations Group 10
PRC Metallurgy Minister Begins Visit 10
PRC Church Delegation Visits Prague *[RUDE PRAVO 26 May]* 10
Zavadil Meets Belgian CP Leader *[Bratislava PRAVDA 27 May]* 10
CPCZ Central Committee's Plans Outlined *[RUDE PRAVO 28 May]* 10
Agenda of CPCZ CC Presidium Session *[RUDE PRAVO 21 May]* 12

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Moscow Summit, INF Treaty Evaluated 13
Honecker Statement 13
Spokesman Remarks 13
Press Comments 14
FRG President Receives Outgoing Envoy 14
Tisch Receives Belgian TU Delegation 14
Sindermann Meets European Parliamentarian 15
Talks With Bulgarians Concluded, Accord Signed *[NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 28-29 May]* 15
PRC Cooperation Talks Begin in Berlin 16
Justice Minister Received by Iranian President 16
Meets Prime Minister 16

HUNGARY

Government Daily Interviews Karoly Grosz *[MAGYAR HIRLAP 24 May]* 18
Nemeth Interviewed on Economic, Social Conditions 23
Pozsgay Address at MSZMP Conference Published *[MAGYAR NEMZET 22 May]* 26

POLAND

Moscow Dispatch on Summit Expectations *[TRYBUNA LUDU 28-29 May]* 29
'Cautious Optimism' About Summit *[TRYBUNA LUDU 30 May]* 29
Siwicki, Baryla Receive USSR's Lizichev 30
Orzechowski Interviewed on Relations With FRG *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 26 May]* 30
Writers Appeal to Jaruzelski for PEN Club *[Hamburg DPA]* 37

ROMANIA

Ceausescu Chairs PEC Meeting on Pay Increases 38
Niculescu Addresses Balkan Cooperatives Meeting 39
Opening of UN Disarmament Session Marked 39
'Military Balance' Through Disarmament Supported 39
CSSR Leaders Send Thanks for Greetings 40
Message to Ceausescu, Dascalescu *[SCINTEIA 28 May]* 40
Strougal Message to Dascalescu *[SCINTEIA 29 May]* 40
American Book on History of Transylvania Noted 40

YUGOSLAVIA

Reports From LCY Conference Discussion Groups 42
Political System Group Meets 42
Socioeconomic Relations Group Confers 43
Development Group Deliberates 45
Federal Chamber's Assessment of FEC Reported *[BORBA 16 May]* 48
Former Defense Minister Commended on Career 54
Presidency Hosts Farewell Lunch *[BORBA 25 May]* 54
Military Council Praises Mamula 54
Slovene Daily Comments on Rumors on Putsch *[Dobersek in Ljubljana DELO 24 May]* 55
MLADINA Questions Kucan on 'Witch-Hunt' 55
Candidate for Slovene Youth President Arrested 56
Impact of FEC Measures in Kosovo Unknown 56
Loncar on Disarmament, Nonaligned Meeting 57

Socialist CC Secretaries Meet in Bucharest

CPCZ Delegation Arrives

LD3105230688 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1400 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] A CPCZ Central Committee delegation headed by Frantisek Pitra, candidate member of the Presidium and secretary of the party Central Committee, arrived by air today in Bucharest to take part in the consultative meeting of central committee secretaries from the socialist countries' fraternal communist and workers' parties. The meeting will discuss the development of agriculture and the food industry.

GDR's Felfe Leads Meeting

LD0106211688 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1339 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] Bucharest, 1 Jun (ADN)—Discussions by the secretaries responsible for agricultural questions of the central committees of communist and workers' parties from socialist countries began in Bucharest on Wednesday. An SED delegation, led by Politburo member and Central Committee Secretary Werner Felfe, is taking part in the meeting. On the same day, he elucidated experiences and results of the agricultural and alliance policy of the SED.

The discussions were opened by Vasile Barbulescu, secretary of the RCP Central Committee.

CEMA Economic Conference Meets in Budapest

Delegations Arrive

LD3105232788 Budapest MTI in English 1812 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Budapest, May 31 (MTI)—The economic policy secretaries of the communist and workers' parties of the CMEA member states are to hold their next conference, in accordance with a previous agreement, in Budapest on June 1 and 2. The delegations, led by the central committee secretaries, arrived in Budapest on Tuesday. The delegation of the Bulgarian Communist Party is led by Grisha Filipov, member of the Political Committee and secretary of the Central Committee; the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia delegation by Jozef Lenart, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee and secretary of the CC; the Communist Party of Cuba delegation by Lionel Soto Prieto, secretary of the CC; the Polish United Workers' Party delegation by Marian Wozniak, member of the Political Committee of the Central Committee and secretary of the CC; the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party delegation by Demchigiyn Molomjamts, member of the Political Committee and secretary of the CC; the Socialist Unity Party of Germany delegation by Guenter Mittag, member of the Political Committee and secretary of the CC; the Romanian Communist Party delegation by Ion Radu, alternate member of the Executive Political Committee of the Central Committee and secretary of the CC; the Communist Party of the Soviet Union delegation by Nikolay Slyunkov, member of the Political Committee of the Central Committee and secretary of the Central Committee; the Communist Party of Vietnam delegation by Vu Oanh, secretary of the CC. The delegation of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party is led by Miklos Nemeth, member of the Political Committee and secretary of the Central Committee. The permanent CMEA representatives of the member states, and Vyacheslav Sychev, secretary of the CMEA, are also participating in the work of the conference.

Hungarian Delegation Listed

LD0106124588 Budapest MTI in English 1120 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] Budapest, June 1 (MTI)—As reported earlier, the secretaries in charge of economic policy issues of the central committees of the communist and workers' parties of the CMEA member countries started a consultation in Budapest on Wednesday. On the first day the delegations which arrived in Budapest on Tuesday exchanged views on the topical issues of CMEA cooperation.

The Hungarian negotiating group is headed by Miklos Nemeth, member of the HSWP Political Committee and secretary of the Central Committee, and includes Jozsef Marjai, deputy prime minister, Pal Tetenyi, president of the State Office for Technical Development, Imre Kovacs, head of the Economic Policy Department at the HSWP CC, members of the Central Committee, Jozsef Nyers, deputy head of the economic policy department, Imre Szokai, deputy head of the foreign affairs department, Lajos Berenyi, deputy president of the National Planning Office, and Sandor Meisel, head of sub-department in the CC's Economic Policy Department.

MSZMP, BCP Secretaries Speak

LD0106211288 Budapest MTI in English 2018 GMT 1 Jun 88

["CMEA Renewal—Statement of CC Secretaries"—MTI headline]

[Text] Budapest, June 1 (MTI)—On the first day of the conference of central committee secretaries of the communist and workers' parties of the CMEA member states, the leaders of the Hungarian and the Bulgarian negotiating delegations gave statements to MTI's staff member.

Miklos Nemeth, member of the Political Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and secretary of the Central Committee, discussed the tasks of the CMEA, and the measures that serve its renewal.

"A debate has been in progress for some time on the reform of the entire CMEA and, as a part of this, renewing the organizational frameworks. I feel the Hungarian standpoint in this issue has, from the very first, been consistent: in accordance with the requirements of the age and the system of conditions of a genuine integration, we have to powerfully switch from simple, bilateral mechanisms, goods exchanges to cooperation that genuinely promotes division of labour, to increasing the role of commodity, financial and credit relations that play a balancing role. It is my conviction that, even with small steps, the renewal of the integration mechanism of the CMEA is progressing in this direction. This shift could already be experienced last year, at the Sofia conference of the economic policy secretaries, and then in Moscow, at the 43rd, special session of the CMEA, and it can be seen at our current conference. Indication of this is that the leaders of the Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Polish and Soviet delegations used a formulaton identical with, or similar to the Hungarian standpoint."

In the following the secretary of the Central Committee said: "We support to simplify the operation of the organization, to press back its bureaucratic features, and declare that economic policy approaches should much rather come to prominence instead of branch-like approaches and simple connections, at the same time, an organization that accords to the functional tasks should be created in the CMEA. Steps have been taken in this direction, and an indentity of views can be experienced between the member states in this issue."

Discussing the relations between the CMEA and the EEC, currently under development, Miklos Nemeth stressed: This mainly has importance from the aspect of the East-West dialogue and relation, and the approach of the two integrations.

Miklos Nemeth went on to note: "Its economic effects and advantages will be shown in practice, but it is my conviction that we shall be able to observe these in a few years. Both organizations influence the fate of Europe, and in my view both the Common Market and the CMEA member states are interested in strengthening the economic bases of cooperation, alongside improving the political conditions.

"Alongside the efforts to establish relations between the CMEA and the EEC, Hungary has for some time been holding talks in the interest of a cooperation agreement with the Common Market. If discrimination is eliminated, the various quantitative restrictions and tariff disadvantages are reduced, and if on this basis we succeed in reaching a reciprocally advantageous agreement, then all this will have direct effects for us," said Miklos Nemeth in conclusion.

Grisha Filipov, member of the Political Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and secretary of the CC, stressed: by connecting the planning-coordination means and commodity and financial relations, an integration mechanism should be created which promotes the extension of direct relations between the economic organizations of the CMEA countries, and the gradual establishment of the community's unified market.

According to the Bulgarian position, he said, attention has to be focused within the field of renewing the activity of the CMEA on the strategic task of accelerating the technical-scientific revolution. This aim requires that the CMEA complex programme be consistently realized, in accordance with the latest tendencies of scientific technical progress. The dynamic and efficient development of socialist economic integration demands the radical transformation of the integration mechanisms. With respect to currency-financial problems, we see the radical road to solving these in the introduction of regional currency convertibility.

Grisha Filipov also said that the social-economic transformation announced in Bulgaria is in close connection to developing socialist economic integration. He stressed that the Bulgarian and the Soviet perestroyka are fully identical in their bases and main goals.

Filipov termed as an important event that representatives of the CMEA and the Common Market are to sign a common declaration in a few weeks, which will doubtless have favourable effects on the development of economic relations between the East and the West.

Pact Leaders at Third UN Disarmament Session

Fischer Opens Meeting

LD0106093488 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1930 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] United Nations, New York, 31 May (ADN)—The UN General Assembly met today in New York for its third special session on disarmament. GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer opened the meeting in the great domed chamber of the UN building, and announced to the delegates of the 159 member states that the meeting is being followed attentively worldwide. "The great interest of the UN member states, which have sent high-ranking government representatives, and the numerous nonstate organizations represented here, underline this. The peoples attach to this forum the hope that disarmament negotiations in the spirit of security through disarmament, agreed upon at the first special session for disarmament, will receive a strong impetus. The most recent positive developments in international relations justify growing optimism."

The GDR foreign minister added that the treaty agreed upon last year between the USSR and the United States concerning the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is the first effective and far-reaching step in nuclear disarmament. Progress is expected from the meeting between General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan taking place at the moment in Moscow. "The coincidence of both events—the summit meeting and this special session—has a deep symbolism. It shows that the dialogue on the decisive question for the survival of mankind—disarmament—is being intensified at all levels, bilateral and multilateral, in the interest of the peoples".

Afterwards, the UN delegates elected GDR deputy foreign minister Peter Florin, president of the 42d UN General Assembly, as president of the special disarmament session.

Peter Florin then spoke and thanked the delegates for the trust in him expressed by his election to the high office. The international situation, he said in his speech, has started moving forward. The elimination of 4-5 percent of all nuclear weapons, as provided for in the treaty on the abolition of intermediate-range missiles, should and can be the start of the road to a nuclear weapons-free world. The conflicts which continue to exist in the world and in which weapons are doing the talking do not appear as insoluble as formerly. The accords on the settlement of the Afghanistan conflict are as much a proof of this as the continuing efforts to resolve the conflict in Central America.

But the nuclear arms race has still not been halted, Florin said. Nuclear weapons tests are continuing. The striving to pile up conventional weapons is continuing in many regions of the world. The arms race is placing an unbearable economic burden on the world. It is obvious that no country and no group of countries can solve the accumulating economic, social, and ecological problems and at the same time finance an increasingly expensive arms race.

Florin said that the latest summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan will give fresh impetus to further negotiations. "As realistic politicians, we know the significance of an understanding between the USSR and the United States for international developments, and that is why we welcome every constructive joint statement and action."

Touching upon the initiatives to promote the disarmament process, Peter Florin also pointed to the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to be held in Berlin at the end of June. He stressed that a halt to the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament has the highest priority. It is certainly no easy task to bring together all ideas and concepts of the states and groups of states. The UN special session will face up to this task, however. The dialogue on a comprehensive system of world peace and international security will be continued. He was confident that the session will become a forum for constructive and successful efforts of the world community to contain the arms race, to search for links in the positions of all groups of states, and to make bold and generally acceptable decisions.

Bulgarian Interviewed

AU0106094988 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 30 May 88 p 7

[Interview with Lyuben Gotsev, deputy minister of foreign affairs, by "representative of the RABOTNICHESKO DELO editorial board," entitled "Disarmament—An Irreversible Process"—date and place not given]

[Text] A representative of the RABOTNICHESKO DELO editorial board interviewed Lyuben Gotsev, deputy minister of foreign affairs, in connection with the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, and its importance for the general activity of the world organization.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Why are the UN member states convening a special session on issues of disarmament? What is the purpose of such forums and more specifically of the forthcoming third special session?

[Gotsev] Discussion about the general principles of cooperation among the UN member states in everything related to protecting world peace and security, including the area of disarmament, is one of the functions of the UN General Assembly. In 1978, in connection with the increased threat of a nuclear catastrophe, the UN General Assembly held the first special session devoted to disarmament. That was a session of everlasting importance, because it defined for the first time the goals,

priority tasks, and principles of international cooperation in the area of disarmament. A program of action was also coordinated at the session.

The tough military-political course followed by certain circles in the West during the first half of the eighties delayed the implementation of that program, and to a certain degree obliterated the decisions of the first UN special session on disarmament.

As a result mainly of new political thinking, recently good sense, realism, and mutual readiness to compromise for the sake of eliminating the nuclear threat and intensifying the process of disarmament are gaining the upper hand. The historic USSR-U.S. INF Treaty has been signed. Prospects for achieving progress in the talks on reducing the USSR and U.S. strategic offensive nuclear weapons by 50 percent, banning the arms race in space, and gradually limiting and stopping nuclear weapons tests, are evident. The contours of an international convention on banning and destroying chemical weapons are emerging. We are on the eve of talks on reducing armed forces and arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. All this confirms the realism of the declaration of Mikhail Gorbachev of 15 January 1986, which presented a program for freeing the world from weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000.

The third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament will analyze the results and trends in the area of disarmament in the period since the 1982 second special session and will determine the conditions, ways, and means of further reducing and eliminating arms and adopting collateral confidence-building and verification measures.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] How and in what directions will the present international situation influence the forthcoming forum?

[Gotsev] The influence of the international situation on such forums is obvious. The interesting question in this case is whether the third UN General Assembly special session will succeed in utilizing the numerous positive elements that have recently prevailed in East-West relations, and specifically, in USSR-U.S. relations. Despite the fact that the world situation continues to be encumbered by serious and contradictory tendencies, it is increasingly being influenced by such major achievements of the new political thinking and actions as the INF Treaty, and the Geneva talks on settling the situation concerning Afghanistan.

I am convinced that the results of the Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan will directly influence the work of the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament. One can expect these results to give a new impetus not only to USSR-U.S. relations, but also to the process of disarmament, and to comprehensively strengthening world peace and security.

Under the present conditions we need such an approach to the problems of international security, which would guarantee a balance of the interests of all groups of states. Already the concluding document of the first special session on disarmament incorporated the concept of security through disarmament. The initiative of the socialist countries to set up a comprehensive system of international peace and security, raised at the United Nations, is a new confirmation of this concept. It proceeds even further, and aims at finding solutions for all global issues of the nuclear-space age, without exception.

The third special session will help to strengthen the positive processes, if it is guided by the striving to come closer in everything related to the conceptual approaches of the various groups of countries, to the problems of disarmament.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Can you describe the basic problems which the present session has to cope with, and the stand that will be adopted by the Warsaw Pact member countries?

[Gotsev] The transformation of disarmament into an irreversible process, into an ever intensifying process, undoubtedly is the main question on which the efforts of the states participating in the session should be focused.

The stand of the socialist countries in this respect is well known—following the first breakthrough in nuclear disarmament we are trying to avoid any situation in which, with disarmament developing in one direction, the arms race would expand in another sphere. The further development or production of "exotic" new nuclear, chemical, or conventional weapons would disrupt the process of increasing confidence in East-West relations and would make the disarmament efforts adopted on a bilateral and multilateral basis meaningless.

It is necessary to achieve as soon as possible such radical measures as a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons by both the United States and the USSR, and an agreement on strictly observing the 1972 ABM Treaty and not relinquishing this treaty within an agreed-upon period. The Soviet proposal to set up an international inspectorate responsible for establishing on the spot whether objects launched and stationed in outer space are weapons or not, or whether they are equipped with some kind of weapon, has also helped to prevent an arms race in outer space.

The third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament should have a decisive influence and stimulate the development of a convention on banning and destroying chemical weapons by the end of 1988.

The problem of naval disarmament urgently calls for a solution as well. Although the states of all continents are interested in this solution, the stand of NATO on starting negotiations with the participation of the great naval

powers, and especially with those that possess nuclear weapons, is extremely negative. The socialist states will continue to search for mutually acceptable, practical solutions to this problem.

We will also search in a constructive spirit for solutions to basic problems, such as making the mutual relations between disarmament and the development and intensification of the organs dealing with disarmament—the Geneva disarmament conference in particular—more effective.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Can you comment on the participation of the Bulgarian delegation in the forthcoming session?

[Gotsev] Under the leadership of Petur Mladenov, minister of foreign affairs, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is ready to participate actively in the work of the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament. This will be in accordance with our country's increased prestige on questions of consolidating international security and disarmament in the Balkans, in Europe, and the world. The contribution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and Comrade Todor Zhivkov's personal contribution to the transformation of the Balkans into a zone free of mass destruction weapons, and to the intensification of confidence and security measures in the area, enjoys extensive international recognition and is becoming increasingly topical under the present circumstances.

At the forthcoming session, the Bulgarian delegation will strive to make a substantial contribution to the adoption of a uniform approach by the session to conceptual problems—such as formulating new principles of disarmament, if necessary, for example—and to further accelerating the solution of specific questions, such as nuclear and chemical disarmament. The discussion and adoption of a comprehensive disarmament program, the text of which has been the subject of negotiations for several years already, is also a goal of the delegation.

Finally, I would like to point out that the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, like the two previous sessions on the same subject, will be a forum of the social forces from all over the world struggling for the victory of the idea of creating a world free of weapons and violence. More than ever before, governments and politicians are listening to the voice of the public whose representatives have confirmed their responsible attitude to the problems of peace and disarmament on several occasions. We expect the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament to develop new ideas in the disarmament sector, and we expect the people's diplomacy to make a specific contribution to this exceptionally complicated sphere in international relations aimed at greater security and peace.

Reagan Meeting With Dissidents Criticized

AU0106175588 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 31 May 88 p 3

[Article by Major Vladi Vladkov, special NARODNA ARMIYA correspondent in Moscow: "Should This Be an Effort To Shift the Focus of Attention?"]

[Text] Moscow, 30 May (By telephone)—It was expected that following the USSR and U.S. success in the difficult marathon for disarmament, and after the signing and ratification of the INF Treaty, the American side would arrive in Moscow with a program in which disarmament questions and specific proposals on the prompt preparation of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons, would play a priority role. However, even before his departure, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, in an interview with West European and Canadian journalists, listed the main issues of the Moscow meeting in the following order: human rights, bilateral relations, bilateral conflicts, and only as the last item, various aspects of armaments control, as the West calls the disarmament process. This list of priorities was confirmed by President Reagan himself during the welcoming ceremony at the Kremlin.

The importance which the U.S. Administration attaches to humanitarian problems is by no means accidental. This approach was selected after a long search for political and propaganda moves. The logic is not very difficult to detect: For some reason or another the treaty on strategic offensive weapons cannot be prepared for signing at the Moscow summit. Obviously, no special political credits can be expected from this aspect for the President's prestige. Why should effective election publicity for the Republican Party not compensate for this aimed at both reassuring those who criticized Reagan for not conducting a "firm policy" toward the USSR, and by the application of old, tested methods which proved effective during the President's first term of office: namely to "attack" with closed eyes, and, simultaneously to prevent people from seeing human rights problems in the United States.

At the Moscow Press Center it became obvious that preparations for this action had started in Washington. According to the agenda, this afternoon President Reagan met at the U.S. ambassador's residence in Moscow, called "Spaso House", a group of so-called "refusniks" (Soviet citizens of Jewish extraction who have been refused permits of emigration to Israel) and "dissidents". The American CNN network which has installed its monitors in the lobby and in the halls of the press center, carried a live relay of this propaganda show during which people, such as the biologist Sergey Kobalev, Yuliy Kasharovskiy, a radio electronic engineer, and the priest Gleb Yakunin tried to act as heroes. In the presence of all major White House figures, they disgracefully slandered their homeland. In his speech, prepared in advance, the President, with rhetoric skill and repeatedly invoking God, tried to convince the twenty-odd people present at the meeting in the residence that as long as he has the strength and with God's help, he will continue struggle for the respect of human rights throughout the world....

We are particularly impressed these days by the work of Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Information Administration. In addition to his daily afternoon operational press conferences, during which, together with Marlin Fitzwater, the White House press representative, he briefs the journalists on the subjects and results of the talks, Gerasimov answers dozens of frequently outright provocative questions. He always answers in a dignified manner, sometimes sharply, but without excessive emotion, and often with a fine sense of humor, but always in a serious, businesslike tone. Commenting on the meeting at "Spaso House", Gennadiy Gerasimov stated that, outside the official negotiations, the President is free to decide which Soviet citizens he would like to meet. "He wished to make his biased 'selection'. These people are by no means the elite of our society, but quite the opposite. I am convinced, however, that materials revealing their true character will appear in the press." Fedor Burlatskiy, the well-known writer and journalist pointed out that about 30,000 informal groups exist in the Soviet Union today, therefore the "Spaso House" incident should not be dramatized.

Another fact, however, has been announced recently. A delegation of American Indians arrived in Moscow to submit a petition on the violation of their rights in the United States to President Reagan....

The Soviet side is willing to engage in a serious and objective dialogue for honestly comparing positions and exchanging views on this subject. It does not avoid discussions either on questions of human rights, or on the comparison of different methods of implementing human rights in socialist and capitalist countries. It does not try to avoid assessing opportunities of developing cooperation in the humanitarian sector. Answering journalists' questions prior to the official talks today, Mikhail Gorbachev proposed establishing a special seminar within the framework of parliamentarian exchange providing opportunities to exchange information and to respectively evaluate the state of human rights.

Ideological disputes have always existed and will in the future exist. However, the question is how are they being conducted, how they are being coordinated by political processes, which in the long run, determine the survival of mankind. We should not permit the subject of human rights to be exploited for creating hostility in inter-state and international relations, for sabotaging the processes of disarmament and detente.

Polish Leaders Greeted on Treaty Anniversary

AU0106095288 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 29 May 88 pp 1, 2

[Greetings Message from Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and State Council chairman, and Georgi Atanasov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Council of Ministers, to Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic, and

Zbignew Messner, chairman of the Council of Ministers on the 40th anniversary of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance Between the Bulgarian People's Republic and the Polish People's Republic]

[Text] Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and State Council chairman, and Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, have sent the following message to Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic, and Zbigniew Messner, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic:

Dear comrades,

On behalf of the BCP, the State Council and Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Bulgarian people, and on our personal behalf we send you, the PZPR Central Committee, the State Council and Council of Ministers, and the fraternal Polish people most cordial greetings and wishes on the 40th anniversary of signing of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance Between the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Polish People's Republic.

The past years have convincingly demonstrated the importance of this historic document for the ascending development of our bilateral relations on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

Under the leadership of the BCP and the PZPR comprehensive Bulgarian-Polish cooperation is acquiring a qualitatively new content and actively contributes to implement the line of socialist renewal and restructuring in our countries. As integral parts of the CEMA and the Warsaw Pact, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Polish People's Republic are consistently contributing to further strengthening socialist economic integration, asserting the new political thinking in international relations, and strengthening security and protecting peace in Europe and the world.

We are deeply convinced that our fraternal friendship and cooperation will continue to develop and expand in accordance with the tasks of the contemporary development of socialism and in the name of our common goals and ideals.

On the day of our common holiday we wish from the bottom of our hearts you, dear comrades, and the entire Polish people further successes in implementing the decisions of the 10th PZPR Congress and in constructing socialism in the Polish People's Republic.

Mitkov Interviewed on Army BCP Conference

AU2905074188 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 26 May 88 p 3

[Interview with Colonel General Mitko Mitkov, chief of the Main Political Administration of the Bulgarian People's Army, by unidentified representative of RABOTNICHESKO DELO: "In Accordance With the Requirements of the Time"—date and place not given]

[Text] The 16th All-Army BCP Conference took place at the end of April. At the time we published a short report on the work of the conference. A representative of the newspaper talked to Col Gen Mitko Mitkov about the chief problems discussed by the army Communists at the conference.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Comrade Mitkov, what main conclusions did the conference reach about the process of restructuring in the Bulgarian People's Army?

[Mitkov] The 16th All-Army BCP Conference was held at a stage of radical change in the development of the country and the Army. The chief aim of the conference was to make a critical assessment of the restructuring that had started and, in the spirit of the tasks set by the BCP National Conference, to equip the Communists and the entire personnel with a specific program for further speeding up and deepening the renewal processes in the Bulgarian People's Army.

The conference reached the conclusion that renewal in the Army is gathering strength, developing in breadth and depth, and is increasingly becoming a profoundly felt necessity for the majority of the Communists and personnel and a part of their personal fate. Our achievements in maintaining combat readiness and in training and educating the troops gratify and encourage us. However, at the same time we are dissatisfied with the rate of restructuring, which does not correspond either to the material, scientific, technical, and cadre possibilities that we have available or to the high requirements set for us by the party and the times in which we live.

This is why the All-Army BCP Conference stressed first and foremost the task of creating all necessary conditions for expanding restructuring on a broad front. In essence, the decisions adopted at the conference laid the ground for a new stage of restructuring in the Army, a stage of practical realization of its aims and tasks in the soldiers and labor collectives, the party organizations, and the dynamic everyday life of the soldiers.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] The party's concept for the further construction of socialism in our country singled out man both as the goal of and as a factor in restructuring. How is this requirement being applied under army conditions?

[Mitkov] Yes, this postulate is also of crucial importance for the Army. It is crystal clear to us that the military man, with his interests and needs, morality and education, stands in the center of restructuring. What does this mean?

First, it means that he is the chief subject of our concern and attention. Thanks to the means that the party and people are allocating, all necessary ideological, material-living, and social conditions have been created in the Army for him to become a comprehensively developed, morally elevated, and highly cultured soldier, a conscious and active participant in the defense of the socialist homeland. As emphasized at the conference,

our efforts in this regard will continue to increase. It is our desire to turn the barracks into a true home for the soldier, into a school for educating worthy defenders and citizens of our socialist homeland.

On the other hand, the military man is also an active element in restructuring. He is, so to speak, the chief character in the play. The results achieved will depend most of all on his commitment to the cause of restructuring. Renewal categorically demands that scope should be given to those of the soldiers who are in the vanguard of scientific and technical progress, who possess high professional, political, and moral qualities, and who have the ability to rally people around the cause of implementing the party policy in real life. As well as this, the new elements that are entering army life are pushing those who are apathetic and indifferent to one side, especially those who are obstructing or setting back the collectives' work in implementing restructuring.

The conference emphasized both the need to show more concern for the cadres and to put more trust in them and, at the same time, the need to make more demands on them and give them more responsibility for the work being carried out.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] One of the basic principles in army restructuring is that of a one-man command. Surely this contradicts the requirements for broadening democracy and glasnost?

[Mitkov] The All-Army BCP Conference devoted a lot of time to this question as well. I will reply in brief. A one-man command is an unshakeable principle of military construction. However, it is effective only to the extent that it rests on democratic principles, such as glasnost, criticism and self-criticism, the collective approach to work, respect for public opinion, and developing initiative and activity among subordinates. This is why the conference pointed out that democratization and glasnost do not conflict with one-man command, but form its natural supports. Furthermore, democratization in the Army is not an aim in itself, but is one of the main mechanisms for involving the human factor in the reforms and in kindling the fire of creativity and innovation.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] What are the principal trends in further increasing the role and influence of the army party organizations and in bringing their work into line with the requirements of the BCP National Conference and the July Concept?

[Mitkov] The July 1987 Plenum of the BCP Central Committee and the BCP National Conference that followed set exceptionally important tasks for the army party organizations. It is a self-evident truth that the quicker and better they restructure themselves, the more successfully will the restructuring in the Army be completed. They now confront the task of making themselves the political vanguard of restructuring and of leading the struggle of the soldiers and labor collectives to achieve qualitative changes in maintaining combat readiness, in combat and political training, in everyday life, and in the other spheres of army life.

One important direction for increasing the role and effectiveness of the army party organizations is the further development of internal party democracy. In this connection, the conference recommended intensifying the collective principle in work, developing criticism and self-criticism, creating guarantees for paying the fullest regard to the views and proposals of the Communists, and strengthening the links with the collectives and the individual.

At the same time the conference set the task of stimulating the activity of the party organizations in improving the quality of the party personnel and increasing the leading role of the Communists in conformity with the new requirements and criteria.

The conference paid especial attention to the application of more effective and flexible forms of party work and, most of all, to increasing the role of the party meeting. As well as this, the conference stressed the need to devote unceasing concern to intensifying the social thrust of party activity, to increasing the role of the party organizations in allocating and promoting the cadres, and further perfecting the style and methods of work and leadership in accordance with the new requirements.

The road of restructuring in the Army is no easy one, but the Army Communists are convinced that it is the only correct road for fulfilling the party's order that the Bulgarian People's Army, now as ever, should be the reliable defender of our great socialist cause.

Armed with the party's July criteria, permeated with the spirit and fire of restructuring, the participants in the 16th All-Army BCP Conference yet again confirmed their close cohesion around the line of the BCP Central Committee line and expressed their firm resolve to put the party's plans into practice in the life of the Army.

RUDE PRAVO on U.S. President at Summit

AU0106182488 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 30 May 88 p 2

[Commentary by Milan Jelinek, special correspondent in Moscow: "The President Is Glad, Very Glad..."]

[Excerpts] The President is glad, even very glad, that he is able to visit the Soviet Union. Ronald Reagan has said it, and it sounded sincere. People have long memories. It is precisely in the face of the event that began to unfold before the eyes of the world on Sunday [29 May] that one cannot help but reminisce. No one wants to be malicious but it must be said, nonetheless, for the sake of sincerity and honesty: When he came to the White House, Ronald Reagan maintained that he would never talk to the USSR; he regarded Soviet society as an "evil empire" and there was talk of a "crusade." What a lot of evil and strong words! Today he is in Moscow and publicly expresses satisfaction with the fact that it has been under his rule in the White House that such an active Soviet-American dialogue has come about, and that strokes of providence have ultimately taken him to the capital of the USSR.

Man proposes, life disposes—that is one way of winding up the chapter of Ronald Reagan's quite recent past. Nonetheless, the ability to get rid of prejudices, at least in the main issues of principled nature, to cast off the untenable, to surmount boulders preventing a truthful view of facts, and to realize the inescapable needs of the day, this ability ranks among those political qualities that must be held in esteem. Yes, it is a sign and an expression of realism and now, toward the end of his political career, in the second half of his Presidency, Ronald Reagan has accomplished it.

The subject of the person of the 40th President of the United States is being broached very often in Moscow nowadays, especially since Saturday, since his interview for Soviet television. A master of the word, expert at turning around sentences and making an impression by gestures and his voice, by his undeniable charm, an expert at dodging unpleasant questions and at turning a problem around so that it ends up on the best possible note for him. So what if, from time to time, truth goes down the drain in the process.

Nonetheless, despite his evasiveness, he did assume one position in the interview when he declared that there must not be a nuclear war. Correct; this is one of the joint resolutions arrived at by the USSR and the United States, one to which paramount importance is rightly ascribed. However, the President added the idea that nuclear weapons have no right to exist, that they are "destabilizing," that people are afraid of them, and that they must be eliminated. What does this mean? Is the United States giving up its doctrine of nuclear containment or deterrence?

The words clash with deeds. The military doctrine drafted by the Reagan administration considers nuclear weapons to be the backbone of U.S. defense forces, Washington is making plans for the modernization of its nuclear arsenal, it avails itself of a long-term program for nuclear armament. The United States refuses to give its consent even to a ban on nuclear tests, tests being, after all, an essential prerequisite for the improvement and production of nuclear weapons. Could it be that U.S. military strategy has turned 180 degrees? No; no one with whom I have had an opportunity to talk in Moscow, including American journalists, believes this. A nuclear-free world has not yet become an objective for Washington. Changes in U.S. policy have not gone that far. The word that fell from the presidential lip was just bombast: an instance of the old ailment of American policy—discrepancy between verbal declarations and practical policy.

The first day of a summit is usually lacking in information, which is conducive to speculations. Regrettably, the assertion appears in great numbers among the 5,000 journalists in Moscow that nothing is going on, that nothing would happen, that they have just come to have their pictures taken. This is incorrect and untrue. [passage omitted]

Documents will be signed. There is no doubt about it. Each of them will be significant, expanding the range of joint Soviet-American endeavor. The most important thing is, and this has been said many times, that dialogue, this sensitive instrument through which people get to know one another, continues. It is being used to a greater extent and that is the only way to arrive at mutual understanding. Dialogue provides an opportunity to come to see that my advantage cannot and must not be to the detriment of the other side. Otherwise I have no advantage but, quite on the contrary, I have created a threat to myself.

During the welcoming ceremony in the Kremlin, Mikhail Gorbachev made his American guest an offer to enlarge his favorite collection of Russian proverbs. "It is better to see once than to hear a hundred times," the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee wished Ronald Reagan. In his reply, the President instantly flaunted another Russian proverb or, rather, a pun, setting a puzzle for many translators for the first evening [of the summit]: "Rodilsya, netoropilsya," [Russian terms used] Ronald Reagan said. Two possible interpretations have been advanced in Moscow thus far (and readers may still come up with some more): "Nothing is so urgent that it cannot wait" and "Slowly, but surely."

The staff of the U.S. CBS television network leans towards the second interpretation and expressed this in the sentence: He really wants to conclude the agreement on strategic weapons and even to sign it himself!

Stepan Receives PRC Foreign Relations Group
LD3105150988 Prague CTK in English
1238 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Prague May 31 (CTK)—The visiting delegation of the Chinese National People's Congress Foreign Relations Committee, led by Deputy Chairman Yao Guang, met today with their colleagues from the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly.

Miroslav Stepan, Czechoslovak Communist Party Secretariat member and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Federal Assembly's House of the People emphasized the intensively developing relations between China and Czechoslovakia which were manifested by the visit of Communist Party General Secretary Milos Jakes to China last week. He stressed that the exchange of views with Chinese deputies would help specify parliamentary contacts and thereby significantly help promote friendship and cooperation between the two countries' peoples.

Stepan stressed the important role of international economic cooperation, and within it the extension of trade exchanges, scientific-technological and industrial cooperation with people's China, in Czechoslovakia's effort to speed up the social and economic development of society.

Yao Guang appreciated the dynamic development of Sino-Czechoslovak relations lately and told members of the foreign relations committees of the two houses of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly about the work of the National People's Congress which set forth at its first session of the current term the road of promoting reforms of the political system and the strategy for the next five-year plan of development. He also expounded Chinese views on international topics.

Chinese deputies asked questions about new legislation being prepared in Czechoslovakia on state enterprises, cooperatives, management of scientific-technological development, legislative procedures in the Federal Assembly, etc.

PRC Metallurgy Minister Begins Visit
LD3105173888 Prague CTK in English
1320 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Prague May 31 (CTK)—Czechoslovak Minister of Metallurgy, Engineering and Electrical Engineering Ladislav Gerle received here today a Chinese delegation led by Minister of Metallurgical Industry Qi Yuanjing.

Ladislav Gerle and Qi Yuanjing signed the statute of a permanent Czechoslovak-Chinese working group for metallurgy, the activity of which will help implement the agreement between Czechoslovakia and China on basic directions of long-term economic and scientific-technological cooperation signed on May 25, 1988 in Beijing.

In the course of their visit, the Chinese guests will visit several factories and will discuss the possibilities of further cooperation in the construction and modernization of Chinese metallurgical plants.

PRC Church Delegation Visits Prague
AU2705193788 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech
26 May 88 p 2

[CTK report in the "International Relations" column]

[Text] A delegation of the National Council of Churches from the PRC headed by Bishop Ding was received by Deputy Minister Vladimir Janku, director of the CSSR Government Secretariat for Church Affairs, in Prague on Wednesday [25 May]. The Chinese guests, who are in Czechoslovakia at the invitation of the CSSR Ecumenical Council of Churches, expressed interest in the life of churches in our country. During their stay in the CSSR they have also met with representatives of church peace organizations and other prominent personalities of Czechoslovak church life.

Zavadil Meets Belgian CP Leader
AU0106121788 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak
27 May 88 p 7

[CTK report in the "From the World" column]

[Text] In the course of his working visit to Belgium, Miroslav Zavadil, candidate member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium, met with Louis van Geyt, chairman of the Belgian Communist Party, in Brussels yesterday [26 May]. The two representatives exchanged views on the further development of relations between the communist parties of their two countries, and stated their positions on the problems of the current international situation and on the development of the international workers movement.

CPCZ Central Committee's Plans Outlined
AU3105181988 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech
28 May 88 p 1

[Editorial: "The Party—The Motive Force of Changes"]

[Excerpts] He who does not have blinkers on his eyes, who does not see the world around himself through dark-colored glasses, must admit: Our people are taking an ever greater interest in public affairs. They discuss things, engage in polemics, and are absorbed in arguments about the methods of tackling economic, political, or ideological issues. We are exploring and adopting effective solutions to many problems that have become ripe. This is assisted by the further developing atmosphere of public information and a policy of openness or, as we are increasingly getting used to saying, glasnost.

But let us not exaggerate. We are only at the very beginning of the transformations that have been discussed since the 17th congress. No, we are not naive

dreamers; we realize that in our society there are also people who have yielded to indifference, indolence, complacency, rigidity, a wait-and-see attitude, and aversion to any changes whatsoever. Sometimes these ominous traits have taken root even in people who, by virtue of the position they occupy, should be the mainstay of reform.

Our Communist Party is the initiator of social transformations and, hence, also their guarantor. This follows from the party's position as the leading force of our society. [passage omitted]

At its ninth session this April, on the basis of a comprehensive, critical, and self-critical analysis, the CPCZ Central Committee set forth the tasks in restructuring party work under the new conditions. [passage omitted] The Central Committee also deals with the style of its own work, in an effort to make its deliberations more open. And, and this is very important, it has also assessed the intentions with regard to the content of its coming sessions. It is reckoned that, this year, there will be sessions of the CPCZ Central Committee on questions of the party's ideological work under restructuring, on the plan of the CSSR's economic and social development for 1989, and on the control of the implementation of the tasks of economic reform.

A later session of the CPCZ Central Committee will check on the implementation of the resolutions on scientific-technical development and engineering. The Central Committee will also discuss the effectiveness of our educational system, conceptual questions concerning the deepening of socialist democracy and self-management, including the election system, as well as key problems concerning the enhancement and protection of the environment and the further improvement of social policy.

However, the standpoints of the April session of the CPCZ Central Committee looked even further ahead—practically up to the next congress of our party. At any rate, the question of changes in the party statutes was raised; these changes should codify a number of principally new norms toward which our party life is gradually working its way.

The next congress should codify in the statutes a limitation on terms of office in elected party agencies. [passage omitted]

Similarly, it will also be necessary to assess an expedient turnover among cadres outside the party, in some other sectors. The question of accumulation of high-level functions and the overloading of other senior officials with functions was also raised.

The party's Central Committee also believes that it will be correct to consider how to utilize and involve in further work—at the level of the Central Committee and regional and district committees—experienced functionaries who have ended their professional political life, but are able to continue to take part in the formulation of party policy and in the control of its implementation.

At annual meetings, but particularly at district and regional conferences, greater use has also begun to be made of the principle of elections by secret ballot, which is an important factor in the development of internal party democracy.

The Central Committee is also beginning to elaborate in a creative and innovative manner many other questions that will undoubtedly be dealt with at the 18th party congress.

The time of innovative reflecting on the problems of party work and social development has also come in other socialist countries. The fraternal communist and workers parties realize their responsibility for the further development of socialism, for its prospects. They also realize that new problems cannot be resolved by old methods. Therefore, while respecting their specific conditions, they are taking measures to implement major social transformations. In view of the momentousness of their current tasks, and in harmony with their conditions, some of them have decided to convene national party conferences between congresses.

The CPSU, too, has convened its all-union conference; it will start on 28 June. The CPSU Central Committee's theses for this conference, the full text of which was published by RUDE PRAVO, Bratislava PRAVDA, and UJ SZO [on 27 May], furnish convincing evidence of a creative elaboration of the theory and practice of socialist construction. [passage omitted]

By virtue of their comprehensiveness and far-reaching wealth of ideas, the theses are also an important source of instruction and inspiration for our Czechoslovak, party and social practice. They are another source of knowledge for us—naturally, next to our own experiences and lessons, based on our national and revolutionary traditions and conditions. They are another source for testing new theoretical and ideopolitical approaches to ensuring the further development of our socialist society. This point of departure will be particularly important in ensuring the drafting of the CPCZ's long-term program, which will be a task of extraordinary importance.

In his speech at the conference of Prague Communists, Comrade Milos Jakes said that "the experiences and the Leninist course of the 27th CPSU Congress, which will undoubtedly be further developed by the 19th All-Union Party Conference, are an inspiration, an example, and a reinforcement for us. We, too, await its conclusions with great interest, because we pursue the same goals as the Soviet Communists, taking a similar path."

Agenda of CPCZ CC Presidium Session

AU3005085888 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 21 May 88 p 1

["Report on a CPCZ Central Committee Presidium Session"]

[Text] Prague—At its session on Friday [20 May], the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium addressed the fundamental issues of the draft of CSSR State closing accounts for 1987, which the CSSR Government will submit to the CSSR Federal Assembly for debate and approval in the very near future.

The session noted that Czechoslovakia's economic and social development became further consolidated in 1987, and the tasks in the creation of material resources were exceeded in 1987. The submitted draft of the CSSR, the CSR, and the SSR state closing accounts affirms with concrete data from the financial and budget sphere that some unfavorable trends continue in economic development, and serious problems and shortcomings, connected mainly with a much too slow intensification, persist. Despite the adopted measures, the unfavorable development in the sphere of costs has not been successfully halted. It was stressed that the preparation of the draft of the state budgets for 1989 and 1990 will require that financial bodies create a more exacting environment for the intensification of the reproduction process in the sense of the tasks of restructuring the economic mechanism in the financial and credit systems. It will be necessary to adapt the activity of all financial bodies to this, and enhance the exactingness and effectiveness of their work.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium also acknowledged a report on the course of the party's regional and city conferences in Prague and Bratislava on 14 and 15 May. It noted that the deliberations of the conferences had a working character, and were marked by openness and a critical and responsible approach. All deliberations expressed the full support for the policy of the Central Committee and the determination to consistently implement the line of the acceleration of restructuring and of the development of socialist democracy.

The Presidium discussed the concept and organizational preparations for the celebrations of the 400th anniversary of J. A. Comenius' birth. The culmination of the celebrations will be an international conference entitled the J.A. Comenius' Legacy and the Man's Education in the 21st Century, which will be held in Prague in March 1992, and which will be attended by prominent pedagogues, scientists, politicians, religious officials, representatives of culture and the arts, as well as literati.

The Presidium decided to organize a meeting of youth with representatives of the Communist Party, of the state and the National Front at Prague Castle on Friday, 17 June, to which 600 young people will be invited.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium also dealt with the preparations for the consultation of the secretaries of the Central Committees of the fraternal parties of the CEMA member states for economic issues, which will be held in Budapest on 1-2 June. The agenda will include tasks concerning the ensurance of the Comprehensive Program of the CEMA Member States' Scientific-Technical Progress Through the Year 2000, and the development of a Collective Concept of International Socialist Labor Division Through the Year 2005.

The Presidium acknowledged a report on the course and results of CSSR Premier Lubomir Strougal's official visit to the Federative Republic of Brazil on 10-15 May 1988, and noted that visit has contributed to the deepening and broadening of mutual cooperation in all spheres. The Presidium was also briefed on the meeting of the Warsaw Pact ministers of foreign affairs in Berlin, and on the official visit by CSSR minister of national defence to the Republic of Austria.

Further intra-party, domestic-political, and foreign-political issues were also on the agenda of the session of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium.

Moscow Summit, INF Treaty Evaluated

Honecker Statement

LD0106165088 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1440 GMT 1 Jun 88

["Statement by Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the SED Central Committee and GDR State Council Chairman, on the Results of the Moscow Summit"—ADN headline]

[Text] Berlin, 1 Jun (ADN)—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and GDR State Council chairman, made the following statement on Wednesday on the results of the Moscow summit:

The results of the Moscow summit between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, meet with approval and support in the GDR. This is only natural since everything that was agreed on in Moscow with the mandate of the allies of the Soviet Union or that was put in process for future agreements on disarmament and detente, for an improvement in the international situation, makes peace more secure.

Particular importance must be attached to the exchange of ratification documents relating to the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. This brings the historic treaty into force and inaugurates nuclear disarmament. From our point of view, encouraging conditions were created in Moscow for the continuation of this process, with a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons belonging to both states. There are prospects for the restriction of nuclear tests and for a global ban on chemical weapons. There is also a justified hope that missiles having a range less than 500 km will be included in the disarmament process. This is in the interests of peace and of both the German states.

It is important that the dialogue between the USSR and the United States on international and national issues be continued. It serves the cause of peace in the world.

In spite of the still-outstanding problems, negotiations on radical conventional disarmament in Europe are to be initiated. New possibilities are opening up for the political solution of regional conflicts.

These are results that benefit not only the USSR and the United States, but all nations. They are an eloquent witness to what political dialogue—given all the differences of opinion—can achieve.

The results of the Moscow summit have strengthened us in the GDR in our efforts to do all we can to remove confrontation and mistrust, to develop mutually advantageous cooperation, and to prevent new tragedies of war. To this end, the forthcoming International Meeting on Nuclear-Free Zones, to be held in Berlin, will for the first time bring together state, parliamentary, and social representatives on an unprecedented scale and will give fresh impetus to the disarmament process.

The prospects for developments in Europe and the world which were opened up in Moscow are further proof of the fact that a world with fewer weapons, and a world without nuclear weapons, is possible. Today, the various forces of reason are making this demand more and more forcefully.

Let us waste no time in continuing down the path opened by the Moscow summit. The nations expect it.

Spokesman Remarks

LD2805141888 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1305 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Berlin, 28 May (ADN)—The GDR, as a country immediately affected by the INF Treaty, has learned of the treaty's ratification by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the U.S. Senate with special satisfaction, Ambassador Wolfgang Meyer, GDR Foreign Ministry spokesman, told ADN in Berlin. Despite all obstacles, the constructive and patient effort of the socialist states to introduce the disarmament process has scored its first important success. By means of the ratification, an encouraging signal has been given to all political forces interested in disarmament and detente to continue their efforts for further important disarmament agreements. The signing of this treaty and the subsequent political and legal processes of its implementation, which are now concluded, has shown the world that even for complicated issues, solutions are possible and attainable if all parties involved allow a sense of realism, perspicacity, and understanding for the interests of the other side to prevail.

Regarding the GDR, the speaker went on, it had, by way of recognition of the great importance of this treaty—as a result of the realization of which entire categories of arms were eliminated for the first time—done everything possible to support its implementation. As early as January, the GDR Government concluded the state procedure for confirmation of the trilateral agreement between the GDR, the USSR, and the CSSR on the requisite inspections connected with the INF Treaty.

In accordance with the stipulations of this agreement, the GDR is currently making practical preparations in order to guarantee problem-free inspections by the United States of former missile sites on GDR territory—one of which is, as is well known, being rebuilt as a holiday home for GDR trade unions. In conclusion the speaker stressed the readiness of the GDR, together with its allies, to contribute to more security in Europe and the world, along the path of constructive dialogue with all political forces. This was also attested by the GDR's

initiative for convening the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to be held in Berlin from 20-22 June, which has met with an extraordinarily strong worldwide response.

Press Comments

LD3105112188 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0112 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Berlin, 31 May (ADN)—Under the headline "Halftime at the Summit," NEUES DEUTSCHLAND writes in a commentary on Tuesday: "The fact that at this summit cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States to mutual benefit is clearly taking an important place and that this is resulting in a whole series of treaties can be assessed as a good omen—not only in the two countries themselves but throughout the world. It is completely clear that the quality of the relations between these great powers of socialism and capitalism is a significant factor for the overall international climate.

"In the past this was felt above all in a negative sense. Now it is clearly being shown how much has changed for the good—despite all continuing differences—in the 2 and 1/2 years since the first meeting between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President in Geneva.

"The reciprocal connection between progress in the area of disarmament and that in trust-building; in economic, scientific, and technological cooperation; and in cultural cooperation is plain. According to the program, tomorrow—Wednesday—at the Moscow summit, the results of the work done by the Soviet Union and the United States since the Washington summit will be revealed."

The commentary continues: "In a joint statement, on which both sides are currently working intensively, both the level reached and the future targets in the four main areas forming the subject of the negotiations will be established. Before Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan sign it, it is planned that they will exchange the documents of ratification and bring into force the treaty signed in Washington on the elimination of intermediate-range missiles.

This is a historic moment, which will show the whole world that hard work done together is getting results. It is also a moment that lends encouragement to the "maximum possible" results in securing peace and consolidating security in the world. And it is clear that in this respect, the issue of further preparation of the treaty on halving the strategic arsenals while observing the ABM Treaty plays a quite special role. The people expect a breakthrough precisely in this area.

FRG President Receives Outgoing Envoy

LD3005213488 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1729 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Bonn, 30 May (ADN)—FRG Federal President Richard von Weizsaecker received ambassador Ewald Moldt, head of the GDR Permanent Mission, in his official residence for a farewell visit.

In the talks with Richard von Weizsaecker, Ambassador Moldt praised the state of relations achieved between the GDR and the FRG. Both sides agreed that the official visit of Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, to the FRG in September, introduced a new period in bilateral relations. Ambassador Moldt affirmed the GDR's readiness to continue a dialogue shaped by reason and realism and to further develop cooperation with the FRG on the basis of the concluded treaties and agreements.

The partners in the talks agreed that a great responsibility rests with both German states for securing peace in Europe. Federal President Richard von Weizsaecker expressed the expectation that further results for disarmament would be achieved at the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Moscow. He thanked the head of the Permament Mission for his activity over many years in the FRG.

Tisch Receives Belgian TU Delegation

LD2905102888 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1857 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Berlin, 28 May (ADN)—Harry Tisch, chairman of the FDGB National Executive, on Saturday received for a talk a Belgian General Federation of Labor (FGTB) delegation led by Chairman Andre van den Broucke. The delegation arrived in the GDR today at the invitation of the FDGB National Executive.

They exchanged views on issues of trade union work and discussed the trade unions' contribution to the struggle for safeguarding peace, and current problems of the international trade union movement.

The two sides emphasized the importance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and said that it is a historic step which will make the beginning of disarmament possible.

This process must continue unabated until the world is free of nuclear weapons. The ratification of the INF Treaty by the U.S. Senate was assessed by the interlocutors as a further success in the worldwide struggle for peace.

Great expectations, it was stressed, are linked to the summit between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan taking place in Moscow soon. Important momentum for disarmament and detente emanating from there

would correspond strongly to the vital interests of all peace-loving people. However, despite all the encouraging results achieved recently in the struggle for safeguarding peace, the disruptive action by certain forces, which represent a threat to world peace, should not be underestimated. The Belgian trade unionists welcomed the early withdrawal of shorter-range missiles from the GDR and emphasized that the conversion of the Waren military base into an FDGB peace project is a good example of how disarmament can lead to social progress.

The FGTB delegation showed a strong interest in the GDR initiative for convening the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones in Berlin in June.

Harry Tisch reported on the tasks of GDR trade unions in the further shaping the advanced socialist society. He explained how the workers, on the basis of broad democratic participation, are actively and in a determined way contributing to further realization of the main task in its unity of economic and social policy. Andre van den Broucke, on his part, gave an overview of trade union work in Belgium. He reported on the FGTB's acton for defending the interests of the workers, for the preservation of jobs, against further cuts in social programs, and for trade union rights and freedoms.

The delegation is to end its visit to the GDR on Monday.

Sindermann Meets European Parliamentarian

LD3005211288 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1439 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Berlin, 30 May (ADN)—To further improve the international situation and to continue the disarmament process it is necessary to use all opportunities. This was underlined by Horst Sindermann, president of the GDR People's Chamber and member of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee, in Berlin Monday in a talk with Horst Seefeld, vice president of the European Parliament. The deputies of the People's Chamber view this as an important task, which they are prepared to confront in political dialogue with the European Parliament.

Horst Sindermann described the visit of the Social Democratic politician, who is in the GDR at the invitation of the International Politics and Economics Institute, as a significant step toward deepening contacts between the People's Chamber and the deputies of the European Parliament.

Horst Seefeld underlined that it is the political aim of the European Parliament toward the non-member states of the EC in Europe to consolidate peace and detente. It supports understanding and continuing to build trust in Europe.

The partners in the talks agreed in assessing the developing parliamentary contacts between the GDR and the EC as an expression of the joint will to live with the political realities in Europe. The president of the People's Chamber pointed to the growth in the responsibility of the parliaments of all states to actively take part in the international disarmament dialogue. In this connection he praised the intention of the socialist group in the European Parliament to take part in the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to take place in Berlin in June.

Talks With Bulgarians Concluded, Accord Signed

AU0106172988 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 28-29 May 88 p 3

[Text] East Berlin (ADN)—At the end of their official talks on Friday [27 May] in Berlin, Willi Stoph, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, and Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, signed a protocol on their talks, in the presence of other distinguished persons. This protocol notes that the "Program for Expanding and Deepening Economic and Scientific-Technological Cooperation Between the GDR and the People's Republic of Bulgaria Through the year 2000," which was signed by Erich Honecker and Todor Zhivkov in September 1987, contributes to increasing the efficiency of social production and to perfecting economic and scientific-technological cooperation. It assesses the state of implementation of the long-term program and sets down further tasks, in particular in the field of key technologies. This applies to the measures to deepen cooperation in the fields of electronics, comprehensive production automation, development of new materials, biotechnology, the chemical industry, energetics, and machine building. On the basis of deepening cooperation in science, technology, and production, conditions for stable and dynamic development of trade are being created. Both sides agreed on a joint statement.

The last day of Georgi Atanasov's official friendship meeting started with the laying of a wreath for the victims of fascism and militarism, at the Unter den Linden monument, in the morning. The Bulgarian statesman was accompanied by Horst Soelle, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers. Deputy Berlin City Commander Colonel Gerhard Schaffrath welcomed the premier and his entourage and accompanied them into the monument. During a minute of silence, the guest bowed before the Eternal Flame and the memorial plaques to the Unknown Resistance Fighter and the Unknown Soldier.

Subsequently, Georgi Atanasov visited the Red Town Hall. Mayor Erhard Krack explained the development of the capital city. He explained how—in particular since the Eighth SED Congress—the implementation of the main task in its unity of economic and social policy is being carried out for the welfare of the people. He referred to the comprehensive housing program. He

pointed to the useful exchange of experiences between Sofia and Berlin on questions of modernization. Georgi Atanasov signed the Golden Book of the city.

During a tour of the city the guests visited the Nikolai Quarter, the Marx-Engels Forum, and the Schauspielhaus theater, where they were welcomed by Culture Minister Hans-Joachim Hoffmann.

At noon Georgi Atanasov was cordially seen off with military ceremonies by Willi Stoph, at Berlin's Schoenefeld Airport. Present were Werner Krolikowski and Alfred Neumann, members of the SED Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers; Rudolph Schulze and Horst Soelle, deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers; Council of Ministers members Erhard Krack, Ludwig Mecklinger, and Felix Meier; other distinguished persons; and the two countries' ambassadors, Egon Rommel and Petur Mezhdurechki.

PRC Cooperation Talks Begin in Berlin

LD3105164088 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1027 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Berlin, 31 May (ADN)—An exchange of views on the state of and prospects for bilateral economic relations was the central point of the fourth meeting of the GDR-China Economic Commission which began in Berlin today. The delegations are led by the chairmen of the two sections of the commission, the ministers for chemical industry of the GDR and China, Guenther Wyschofsky and Qin Zhongda.

Both partners paid tribute to the progress achieved since the third meeting of the economic commission in May 1987 in Beijing in developing the contractual bases for long-term cooperation and in the development of trade. During the meeting the guests will visit GDR enterprises which are of significance for the development of economic and scientific-technological cooperatiton.

The 15th meeting of the GDR-China Permanent Commission for Scientific and Technological Cooperation also began today. It is dealing with the realization of the main areas of long-term cooperation agreed upon in the fields of science and technology. The preparation of cooperation in the area of key technologies, including microelectronics, biotechnology, and construction of scientific equipment, will also be discussed.

Justice Minister Received by Iranian President

LD3005230888 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1851 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Tehran, 30 May (ADN)—Hojjat ol-Eslam Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, received in Tehran on Monday Dr Hans-Joachim Heusinger, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers and justice minister, for a friendly talk.

The GDR politician conveyed personal greetings from Erich Honecker, GDR State Council chairman, which President Khamene'i reciprocated.

Both partners in the talks praised the stable and continuously developing bilateral relations between Iran and the GDR, and underlined their intention to further deepen peaceful cooperation, in the future, to their mutual advantage. They discussed the international situation and agreed that the preservation of mankind from a nuclear catastrophe is a vital matter for all peoples.

Hans-Joachim Heusinger explained the GDR's actions directed toward peace and disarmament and gave information on the concerns of and preparations for the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to take place in Berlin in June 1988.

President Khamene'i welcomed this initiative from the GDR and assured the participation of a representative Iranian delegation led by presidential adviser Mostafa Mir Salim. The Iranian president comprehensively presented the attitude of his country on the situation in the Gulf and particularly condemned the foreign naval presence.

Minister Heusinger expressed the deep concern of the GDR about the continuing conflict in the Gulf region. The GDR supports a political resolution of the conflict as soon as possible, on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution No 598, taking the legitimate interests of both sides into account.

Taking part in the talks were the ambassadors of both states, Guenther Fritsch and Hamid Reza Asefi.

Dr Hans-Joachim Heusinger arrived in Iran yeterday for an official visit at the invitation of 'Ali Reza Mo'ayeri, deputy prime minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Meets Prime Minister

LD3105205588 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1847 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Tehran, 31 May (ADN)—In Tehran today Mir Hoseyn Musavi, prime minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and Dr Hans-Joachim Heusinger, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers and minister of justice, discussed the successful development of political dialogue and economic and scientific-cultural relations between the GDR and Iran. They spoke in favor of expansion of cooperation in the interest of peace and detente.

They agreed that, despite all ideological differences, the development of constructive bilateral cooperation between the states makes a considerable contribution to the improvement of the international climate.

Minister Heusinger conveyed greetings from Willi Stoph, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, which were reciprocated by Mir Hoseyn Musavi. Minister Heusinger informed him about the forthcoming International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to be held in Berlin, and about other activities of the GDR in support of the process of disarmament and detente.

The partners in the talks stressed the need to do everything to save mankind from a nuclear inferno. The creation of nuclear and chemical weapons-free zones is an effective step toward that end. The expectation was expressed that the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow will give further impetus to the process of disarmament already begun.

The Iranian prime minister described his country's view regarding the war with Iraq and the situation in the Gulf region. The GDR politician expressed his country's great anxiety concerning this conflict and stressed the urgency of a political solution. The GDR sees the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution No 598 as the appropriate way to stop hostilities immediately, to end the war, and to contribute to detente in the Gulf region. Mir Hoseyn Musavi agreed with Hans-Joachim Heusinger that the massive presence of a Western fleet in the Gulf region considerably aggravates the situation.

Dr Heusinger ended his official talks in Tehran today.

Government Daily Interviews Karoly Grosz

AU3105201088 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 24 May 88 pp 1, 3, 4

[Interview with MSZMP General Secretary and Premier Karoly Grosz by MAGYAR HIRLAP Domestic Policy Columnist Dezso Pinter: "I Believe That What We Are Doing Today Is Very Important for the Country—Karoly Grosz on the Party Conference, the Renewed Bodies, on Janos Kadar, and on Further Changes"—in his office in Parliament on 23 May]

[Text] [Pinter] Only a few hours have passed in the first working day following the national party conference, and you have spent these hours in talks. Would you rather be alone now?

[Grosz] No, under no circumstances would I prefer to be alone now; on the contrary, I have a great need now to be with my fellow workers. We have a lot of questions to discuss and to answer.

[Pinter] The whole country expected a lot from the party conference; most people expected the beginning of a historical change. The way I saw it, in the weeks and months preceding the party conference, you did not try to reduce this high level of expectation. What is your opinion now? Were you right in doing this?

[Grosz] Yes. Quite some time ago, I could say that more than 1 year ago, other people who work in various fields and I came to the conclusion at about the same time that the concept of the 13th MSZMP Congress dealing primarily with economic and social policy issues would not stand the test of time. On the other hand, the desired economic changes cannot be implemented only by means of economic measures; therefore, the congress lacked the means, the political means, not the intention to implement this economic program. That is why I believe, as I did in the past, that there is need for change and this must be prepared politically. It was clear that half solutions can offer no way out from this situation. We discussed this thoroughly in the course of preparing the government program of September 1987. Therefore, whatever took place recently, not concerning myself but the political area, was foreseeable and necessary. There was need for a change, for a turn, because this would forge together the new unity and the new personnel, political, and social conditions.

[Pinter] On the basis of observations made by the delegates, the Draft Policy Statement of the party conference was changed during the very last minutes. Apart from some votes against and abstentions, the delegates approved the document. I am not asking you to make any predictions about whether all the party members and generally public opinion agree with this Policy Statement because, obviously, more time is needed to answer this question. I want to know your personal evaluation: Do you think something is missing or do you have any reservations about some of the formulations in this document?

[Grosz] Look, there is no perfect document. I have not yet come across a document which could not have been improved on after publication and approval. Of course, there are things I miss in this document too. It does not answer many questions, and many issues—government work and the formulations concerning the activity of the Council of Ministers, to give a few examples—make up only a few lines of the document. In spite of this, I think it contains everything from the major issues. All these are sufficient to develop a more dynamic and firm activity and to outline clearly every major direction. The Policy Statement must function as a work program until the 14th MSZMP Congress and we can continue to build on the basis of its main pillars.

[Pinter] You have already touched upon my next question: To what extent did the party conference agree with the efforts so far of the government you have been leading? Were there serious warnings addressed to the government?

[Grosz] There were no direct warnings, but there were, of course, indirect warnings. Let me say here that, even without warnings, I know the weak point of this government, and when anything connected with this was voiced at the party conference, it only confirmed my conviction. Therefore, there was no difference of opinion at all between my evaluation of the situation and that of the speakers at the conference. During these 10 months, the government has not yet been able to fundamentally cope with the task of enforcing a change in the economic management and in the economy. In spite of the most strenuous efforts, the government has failed to create the social conditions that would provide the economy with more favorable circumstances and greater scope. If you ask me now whether it would have been possible to do much more than that, I will tell you that, essentially, we could not have done much more qualitatively, because changes take time. Nobody should have illusions. The reorganization of the government is a goal set for the end of the year, and now we are just halfway there. We are working in an international environment and perhaps one can trace our great efforts to widen the government's international relations. The results of these efforts will only emerge later. It was impossible to achieve a qualitative change in such a short time, but it would have been possible to do more or rather more valuable things. I am not yet ready with my inventory.

Unity in Implementation! [subhead]

[Pinter] Although in a different tone and based on partially different arguments, the delegates to the party conference generally spoke about the need to institute reforms. Will there be, or can there be, such unity in the introduction of further reforms and in their implementation?

[Grosz] Political history proves that it is easier to achieve unity in setting out the goals than in implementing them. The deeper we get into the implementation of the program, the more local interests and often personal interests emerge and confront each other.

We must also take into account that often when we propose a great program with enthusiasm, we do not even know exactly what we have taken upon ourselves. New burdens and conflicts facing us emerge on the way, and only then can we see clearly the direct consequences of all this. I do not have any illusions in this respect either; it is only natural that there is great enthusiasm and strong determination now, but the undesired side effects of all this have already emerged.

[Pinter] In what form?

[Grosz] In the sense that many people also want to reform things that need to be reformed.

[Pinter] Would you give an example?

[Grosz] We do not have 11 parallel programs running; I regard 11 reform programs too much in themselves! And these programs affect very important sectors: think of the budget reform, the wage reform, and the social policy reform. Thirty years of gradually accumulated tensions cannot be eliminated overnight. The dangers of the reform derive from the many illusions that accompany the reform. Many people think that the reform will change everything. It is work, not the reform, that will change the situation. The reform is only a means of creating better opportunities for more efficient work. This is time-consuming job. The decisions we are making now will bring valuable results only in several years. I repeat, the reform creates opportunities; the extent to which we can make use of this opportunity depends on our persistent daily work. In the prevailing great reform mood, many people think that we will pass 10 reforms and the country's situation will change. This is not so. In many areas, all we need is normal and good work, not reform. It would be extremely difficult to make anyone accept, for example, that inefficient use of our production capacity derives from the weaknesses of reform.

[Pinter] What statistics do we have on this?

[Grosz] In 1980, we increased the amount of time the major basic factory machines could be used in industry to 60.4 percent; the same figure for 1987 was 54.1 percent. Another example: The use of relatively modern and efficient machines and installations in large-scale industrial investment projects that were finished in the eighties and which exceeded 100 million forints is increasingly lagging behind the industrial average, and stood at only 40 percent in 1985-86. This is not connected to the reform. Should I continue? The operational time of investment projects finished in 1986 made up about 20 hours, or almost 2 and 1/2 shifts; during this time, however, the idle time was very high. The average daily working time of the new industrial projects under survey is only 9.6 hours. This is an issue of work organization, work discipline, and interest, and not of reform.

Two-Way Changes [subhead]

[Pinter] There are people who talk about compromise, and there are others who talk about the laws of development; everybody agrees, however, that party unity has another content. In this respect, how must our attitude and practice change? To what extent can one clearly see the road leading to the new party unity of a changing content?

[Grosz] As a result of social development and of political culture, the concept of party unity is gradually changing in our movement. Earlier we understood by this concept that, following the debate in the internal workshops of the party, we must represent the positions of the party on essential issues in a strictly identical way, in an identical tone, in an identical orchestration, and sometimes even in identical formulations. There is a 2-way change now: first, in the way the unity will emerge, and second, the way in which we will represent the opinion that has emerged. In the former, the essential change lies in the fact that the movement should build itself more from below. I said "more" because no leadership can ever be banned from spreading its own decided efforts and introduce these into the movement. At the same time, we have to be more open to grass-root initiatives and integrate them into the intellectual and political processes that are shaping the unity. The other change is that we must accept a much more multifaceted and richer practice of representing the uniform efforts on basic issues. The issue is not only that the jointly adopted position should reflect the individual traits of the Politburo and Central Committee members—this can be achieved in no time. The issue is rather that—and this is more difficult to achieve—the party members in the basic party organizations and in the local communities should represent the main political endeavors in compliance with the local conditions. And this is a new approach to unity.

[Pinter] In April this year, the Central Control Committee expelled four party members from the MSZMP. Both in the Western press and at home, I came across views according to which the reasons behind the expulsion—for example, the violation of the principles of party unity—can change following a reform-oriented party conference. Have they changed?

[Grosz] I do not think they have. Every party and non-party member has the sovereign right to evaluate the abovementioned decision. I think, that in the future too, no party can be denied the right to break with members whose conduct is considered violating the policy of the given party. The four people expelled from the MSZMP can appeal to the congress, as no other body is entitled to alter the decision.

Critical Analysis [subhead]

[Pinter] Several people at the party conference—including you—spoke about their personal responsibility and about the fact that they played a role in making wrong decisions. A phase that promises changes can hardly be successful without carefully analyzing the mistakes committed in the recent past, because one can learn from all these. Will there be such analysis, and if so, how can the public acquaint itself with the conclusions of this analysis?

[Grosz] It transpires from the issued document that the Central Committee has stipulated the establishment of a work committee to carry out a critical analysis of the past 10 to 15 years and to submit a report to the 14th MSZMP Congress. The next Central Committee meeting will set up the composition of this work committee. Obviously, the material compiled during the debates based on the experience of experts and party activists must definitely be made public. Of course, the party organs and not the general secretary will have to decide on this. I think it is important not to wait until the analysis has been completed. Many things have already become clear, like, where we failed to thoroughly consider the problems, where corrections are necessary, and the type of changes necessary. In the summer of 1987 the Central Committee published the majority of these tasks which the government program had formulated. I cannot imagine that a large-scale analysis will start now, or at the end of this analysis, we will review everything and will publish a book, which will change the entire practice. My opinion is that we must draw lessons from all the observations that we are sure are not superficial or the product of haste, and include these lessons in our activity in due course. Nothing changes overnight in politics; it derives from the nature of politics that it transforms gradually. One more thing has to be taken into account: A policy is shaped by people of different values, different qualities, and different weaknesses. We must have confidence that the recently renewed Central Committee and the newly elected executive bodies will bring about better quality, and thus, everyone will also manage to reach to his own conclusions, which will include the lessons of the analysis. We cannot wait until we settle this issue sometime in the future. We must continue what we are doing.

[Pinter] Let me ask you now a question that you will have to answer many times both at home and abroad, but I do not know for how long. You are the general secretary of the party and the premier. At the first sight, this change does not seem to be very logical at a time which demands the modernization of our political institutions. I feel slightly embarrassed because I should ask this question primarily of the newly elected Central Committee members: What were the reasons for this decision?

[Grosz] The reasons for my election as general secretary of the party are unknown to me. I became prime minister last summer, more precisely 10 months ago. If, at the time, the leadership had planned to count on my work in the party—not necessarily as general secretary but as some district head or district secretary—it would, of course, not have proposed my appointment as head of the government and would have looked for another solution. The decision that my work is required by the party has been obviously made in the meanwhile. My activity in the government must also have had a part in my election, but I do not know for sure. I could not yet really think it over, things went too fast. In my opinion, it is not a question of whether the decision was logical or not, because we did not say that these two posts cannot be filled by one person; what we did say was that the leadership of the government and of the party are not identical with the general secretary and the prime minister. Above all, the decisionmaking process should be separated: The Central Committee and the Politburo should not decide on issues that fall within the authority of the government, or at least, they should approach these issues from a different angle.

According to international practice, the essence of party guidance is that parties are engaged in working out their policy and governments are engaged in implementing this policy with great freedom and according to the changing circumstances. If the government is unable to fulfill this task, the party will dismiss its government. I put this in quotations marks because, formally, it is not the party that dismisses the government, but almost always the parties initiate the change of governments, not only when the parties win or lose great elections but also in their course of everyday activity. Therefore, if the ruling, or governing party is dissatisfied with its own government, it will initiate the dismissal of this government parliament. There are numerous examples of this practice.

Another essential thing connected with the separation of tasks is that the working style and working order of the executive apparatus have to be altered in order to avoid overlapping. It is important—as we mentioned last year—that the party quidance does not mean that the executive state apparatus is controlled by the party apparatus, because this would lead to chaos. In the activity of the government, party guidance means that on behalf of the party, the prime minister implements the political will by means of its own apparatus, and not that independent party officials implement their own will in the name of the party. There is an ideological and practical disturbance here, and we must put this in order.

Besides, there are many examples in the world of one person being both the prime minister and party leader. According to our domestic experience, however, it is better if the two posts are filled by the same person, so the present situation is to be considered temporary. This is a matter of practice and not of principle. We are in the middle in a whole range of issues. For example, we promised to reorganize the government by the end of the year, and it would not be sensible now to hand it over to someone else because this might postpone everything by

even 1 year. No matter how difficult it is, I must finish what I have started so that I can pass the job on to my successor who I do not know yet. These tasks, which concern the fate of the people, the handling of affairs, and the viability of the country can only be accomplished with great care and responsibility and not in a rush and according to our moods.

There are also international relations: The head of the government has a series of international commitments, like invitations he has accepted, and people who accepted his invitation, and so on. I could come up with further reasons, but this is perhaps enough to show that we must conclude the transitory period with calm, consistent, and systematic activity.

[Pinter] How will the country and the world know clearly who is speaking: the party general secretary or the premier?

[Grosz] In political issues, nothing happens if the two intermingle. In politics, the head of the government must say the same thing as the party general secretary. Of course, it is different when the government makes a statement or takes a position, and this is very easy to recognize because this happens at the session of the Council of Ministers and on the basis of a decision of this body. If the party general secretary signs a document, this document has been decided on at the meeting of the Central Committee or of the Politburo. For me, this does not lead to any confusion in everyday work, nor in any other areas.

Personnel Issues [subhead]

[Pinter] Due to your position of party general secretary, you will inevitably have less time for guiding the activity of the government. Is giving more authority to one of your deputies being temporarily considered?

[Grosz] No deputy premiers will receive more authority because, in the current setup, they also have their sphere of authority and they work independently. My principle is that one should not interfere in the activity of one's colleagues if one has confidence in them. If one does not have confidence in them, one should not think too much and should replace his collaborators. Here, everyone should know his job and should take responsibility for his decisions.

At the same time, however, it is also necessary to establish a new working order and a new cast for the temporary period. One element in this is that we will propose that the National Assembly appoint a state secretary, in accordance with the Constitution. We would have initiated this even if the current particular situation in which I have to fill two posts had not emerged. We declared last year that we wanted a government that is better and more independently engaged in politics and that we would modernize the mechanism of interest coordination between the government and the public organs. The recently adopted party Policy Statement also obliges us to carry this out in our government activity, so we need a leaders of ministerial rank to organize the government relations within the processes of interest coordination. This does not require a committee, and I am firmly against committees because, it is very difficult here to pinpoint concrete and personal responsibility, no matter how honorable the intentions. That is why we need a leader who accepts this task, and this is the state secretary.

[Pinter] The government must be open toward the scientific activity. What does that mean?

[Grosz] The government is not a laboratory where tests are conducted, and it is not suitable for scientific research. One of the great weaknesses of government activity is that the analysis and evaluation of the sociopolitical consequences of its decisions and even the preparation of the society for expected decisions are not thoroughly considered and scientifically founded. Our Academy of Sciences has many high-quality institutes and advisory bodies, but all in vain, because it cannot solve this task. Therefore, we must set up a situation in which the intellectual values of social science workshops are included in the preparation of government decisions and in the forecasting of possible effects.

In my opinion, in the wake of the decision made on Sunday, the personnel changes which we had planned to carry out by the end of the current year have to be accelerated. If the Central Committee had not decided to appoint me as the party general secretary, I think, we could have appeared before the parliament in September or December, according to the original program. However, now it seems that a few government personnel issues have to be settled more rapidly.

Study and Division of Labor [subhead]

[Pinter] We are now sitting and taking in your study in the parliament. It is perhaps not only a formality to ask: Will you move out?

[Grosz] I will not move out now. I will move out if a decision is made to propose that the National Assembly should appoint a new prime minister. Until then, I will work here.

There are rooms in the Central Committee where meetings must be held and there is a study there where I can meet with my fellow secretaries. But I am not going to move out and I will stay here until I am released from the position of premier and I can continue my activity as party general secretary.

[Pinter] Is there an approximate deadline for this?

[Grosz] I think I will have to carry out the reorganization concepts, the personnel changes, and the international programs this year. All these are planned for the end of

the year. Then, I hope things can be changed as early as possible, because I repeat, the burden of these two functions is extremely heavy. The party movement—as the recent party conference indicated—is facing a large number of questions that require the undivided attention of a person to solve them. The party general secretary must deal with organizing the internal life and the activity of the party.

[Pinter] How will task between the general secretary and the party chairman be distributed?

[Grosz] We have not yet discussed this in detail. The idea of the post of party chairman is the intellectual result of the past few weeks. Many other solutions could have been found. Comrade Kadar asked to be relieved from operative work, and we asked him to remain in the political public life. Other posts, like advisory or other posts, could also have been found, but we chose to build on the traditions of the Hungarian workers movement. The election of a party chairman—a practice still valid in the social democratic movement in Western Europe—was a traditional practice in the Hungarian social democratic movement. This duty was always given to the most experienced leaders with the greatest prestige in the workers movement. We decided to adopt this practice in the Hungarian system of political institutions. We must consider the Hungarian political traditions when developing the Hungarian political style. This is how the idea of Comrade Kadar's new post of party chairman was born. He has tremendous experience in the international workers movement and in the international political life, and I have very little such experience. He can certainly contribute most to the cause if he takes more upon himself in this activity. To date, he could not undertake more because of his daily routine, as he chaired the meetings and prepared for them. Comrade Kadar's vast practical experience is no less important. He could give a lot not only to the present but also to the future if he developed these experiences on a theoretical level. This needs time, and it cannot be carried out by thinking something over between two meetings and then writing it down. We should ask Comrade Kadar's help not primarily for the present, but for shaping our future policy.

[Pinter] If anyone had doubts about it, you dispersed them at your press conference in London when you spoke with convincing force and respect about Janos Kadar's historical role. From your words, I felt that there are also more intimate human relations between you and Janos Kadar. If the question is too personal, please excuse me for it: What was the atmosphere in which the two of you discussed the changes?

[Grosz] The relationship with Janos Kadar is very pure and very human. I hold him in extremely high esteem, and I have always respected him, continue to respect him, and I will also respect him in the future because, I came to know a personality whom I consider an example. I had the rare opportunity to be active, although not directly around him, at least somewhere around "the orbit of the moon" for almost 2 decades. Of course, I watched his activity from a different position than he watched mine, but we had many opportunities to discuss matters, meet, hold debates, and even formulate sometimes opposing opinions on certain issues. Meanwhile, I think that the respect which has been always present on my side has been returned. The way we have been discussing these changes lately—in the last weeks, since this has not been going on for years—I felt that he also appreciated my work of recent years, as it was he who proposed me for the position of general secretary. I do not say that we have always agreed, or still agree on everything, but it is only natural that one formulates his difference of views, which is also a part of mutual respect. In my opinion, a real friendship is one in which the people do not keep praising each other but tell each other what they think, even if they are wrong.

Refreshening in the Leading Bodies [subhead]

[Pinter] What does the new composition of the Central Committee and of the Politburo represent to you?

[Grosz] There are considerable fresh forces in both the Central Committee and the Politburo. I think the people here work with the same commitment as previously, measured by political standards. Those who have worked in these bodies so far have also served the cause of socialism and the party wholeheartedly and honestly, as do the newly elected. So, no political difference can be made here.

There are, of course, certain changes. The members of the Central Committee are younger. I welcome the fact that several outstanding intellectuals are participating now in the activity of the Central Committee. This is an important development because, in order to shape policy, we need these people's work style and the experience they brought from their activities, and we also need their personalities.

As for the Politburo, I think that its present members are committed to the renewal process which we already started and which we want to accelerate now. As I see it, this Politburo will soon become an intellectually homogeneous body too. It is important that the Politburo has people like Comrade Rezso Nyers, who has great political and workers movement experience and who also participates in the scientific life; or Comrade Ilona Tatai, who has vast experience in the activity of economic organization, and who is the general manager of one of our most successful enterprises, an enterprise that reached this high level of activity through its own efforts and will; or Comrade Pozsgay, a well known person in our country, with remarkable intellectual capacity and a great deal of political experience. We have been colleagues for years, and I know that he analyzes the current Hungarian reality very critically and with an up-to-date approach, and he also knows what he wants. The Politburo is, therefore, a multifaceted body, but this is the

way to become a new unity and real center in charge of preparing the activity of the Central Committee and contribute to the policy-making process by making decisions between the Central Committee meetings. A certain degree of change is needed here too: The Central Committee must turn into more of a workshop for shaping our policy. Consequently, the role of the Politburo will change to a certain degree, since it will participate primarily in political preparations and will not appear with finalized decisions.

[Pinter] Has the institution of Secretariat ceased to exist?

[Grosz] It is not correct to say that it has ceased to exist; we did not elect a Secretariat, "only" a general secretary and other secretaries. This means that the Politburo will have to take a greater share in organizing implementation, something that until now has been mostly the responsibility of the Secretariat. I agree with all this primarily because the present 3-level system of decision making will become a 2-level one, and thus, its working methods will be less complicated and its working style will adjust better to the genuine issues.

Our Principles Are Crystal Clear [subhead]

[Pinter] What is the first international reaction to the party conference and the personnel changes? What kind of reaction do you expect in general?

[Grosz] For the time being, I cannot say much about this. I received Comrade Gorbachev's flattering good wishes and the telephone greetings of several ambassadors. I went home at dawn and I started work at dawn too, so I was not able to deal too much with reactions. As to what will and can these reactions be like? I think our friends welcome the changes, and not only because they consider these changes internal Hungarian party affairs, but also because we have never left any doubt by our decisions or words as to the direction we want to take: the road leading to socialism. The ways and means of socialist construction have been chosen by every party by itself for a long time now. I think attention will rather be focused on whether we can introduce new methods and elements into this work, as we mutually learn from each other's experiences. For a long time now, we have not been copying anyone, and nobody will copy us either, but we will learn from our experiences and will apply these experiences to his own conditions.

As for the workers movement and our state and political relations outside the socialist world, I do not expect relevant changes. They know us well. We always conduct an unambiguous foreign policy, which has its organizing principles. We want peace and cooperation based on mutual interests. We respect others and, at the same time, we expect the same respect for us. We have crystal-clear principles, and our policy has not changed at all in this respect.

We Must Have Confidence in Ourselves [subhead]

[Pinter] Finally, it is not a formality to say that we wish you strength to fulfill your tasks, and if I may add something to this, we also wish you a little luck in all this.

[Grosz] Luck is always welcome and can be a good ally, but, all my life, I have always had to work very hard for everything. Everything I believe in is connected with work. I believe that everything we are doing now is very important for the country. I know that this road will not be a short or free of conflicts because we must achieve a tremendous change in pace. All these are not only the consequences of our own mistakes, but they also play a great role; of course, we could have shortened the time needed for restructuring and we could have done this a little more efficiently. Whatever the past, the processes under way in the world, the new qualitative phase in the technical-scientific revolution, the entire energy issue, the issue of raw materials, the resulting price increases, the transformation of the financial world, and the conflicts deriving from the internal renewal of socialism—all these are a difficult lesson to everyone. Even if we had been able to work perfectly so far and if we were able to continue to work perfectly, we still could not avoid the difficulties inherent in restructuring. Of course, what kind of difficulties there are make a difference. It is possible to reduce the burdens and the pains of birth with intelligent and careful activity and without a rush, but it is impossible to eliminate them. If we have a little luck now—let us say, if the market prices always developed according to our wishes—this, of course would be favorable for us. It would be good if rain came when it is needed for agriculture, and many other things would be good, but we must have confidence in ourselves, not in luck.

Nemeth Interviewed on Economic, Social Conditions

LD2805224588 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1400 GMT 28 May 88

[Interview with MSZMP Central Committee Secretary Miklos Nemeth by Correspondent Akos Mester in Budapest—live; from the "168 Hours" program]

[Text] [Mester] One of the most frequently mentioned words at the party conference was, naturally, resurgence, but I had the feeling that many people appeared to differentiate between political and economic resurgence, although obviously there is a kind of reciprocal effect here.

[Nemeth] I fully agree with you. The 1968 reform mechanism—or more precisely the 1966 Central Committee standpoint—already contained the most essential elements of the reform of the system of political institutions and of social policy. Unfortunately, in practice this reform unequivocally narrowed down to an economy-centered reform. Indeed, what is more, we implemented that reform only half-heartedly and inconsistently.

[Mester] For a long time, we thought that we could conceal our troubles concerning a political balance, but that our troubles concerning economic balance were too striking for this, and they could not be kept secret from public opinion, although we attempted to do so a good number of times in recent years.

[Nemeth] I regard it as most important that although since 1968—indeed I shall go further back—since 1957, the party has constantly announced a reform policy, while in reality it never carried out the change and the necessary corrections in economic policy. Rather, under the pressure and impact of the constraints, we put off solving the problems. It was clear in 1957 that the structure of the Hungarian economy did not accord with either the country's wealth or the requirements of that period. In reality, the party made the first resolute response in 1979, when it recognized that the course which the Hungarian economy had run until then would lead to a catastrophe: The imbalance that could emerge in the Hungarian people's economy in the next 1 to 2 years was of such a scale that it could only be corrected by drastic measures, with unforeseeable consequences in the long term.

[Mester] That was in 1979 and in truth, in my opinion—excuse me for saying this—even in 1988 we have not completely put aside false illusions. Just think: You said at the party conference that more abundant material resources cannot be obtained solely by economizing or by reallocating funds. This is so evident that one is simply surprised why the participants in the party conference should be told this in 1988. You also added that bolder, freer enterprise than at present is necessary. I believe that no one disputes this. That is not the problem, but rather that there is no institutionalized form for encouraging enterprise. People undoubtedly see, if they start some undertaking which produces more output and generates greater profits, that ultimately the greater profits are loaded with a very high tax burden.

[Nemeth] That is why we considered it timely that we should create a modern company law which accords with current requirements, the requirements of the present period, and that we should introduce it as soon as possible, so that the diversity of possibilities should be decided by the individuals, the enterprises, and the cooperatives—and thus the entrepreneurs and so that the structure should be constantly transformed in accordance with the requirements of the market and of demand; it should change: that is, it should become more flexible, more able to adapt.

[Mester] This is very necessary, if only because if the situation does not favor those with an enterprising disposition, it, in my judgement, will as a matter of course favor the mediocrities, those from whom there is no trouble, but who do not usually produce profits. However, we need profits, that is fully evident, and the time has come for us to break with favoring the mediocrities.

[Nemeth] Until now this meant in practice that in Hungary, as a consequence of the many kinds of subventions, subsidies, kinds of support, systems of subjective relations, and hierarchical dependencies, enterprises and individuals alike were able to obtain satisfactory incomes with weak performances, or with products which were less and less in demand on the world market. We have to break with the habit of supporting mediocrity: that is, we have to accept the risks, accept the consequences, the conflicts. In that case, there is a hope that in 3 to 4 years the fruits or results of this will appear. In my conviction, this will restore confidence to entrepreneurs, enterprises, and individuals alike.

[Mester] You said at the party conference that our enterprises are gradually losing real touch with the market. You based this on the fact that, unfortunately, we have artificially separated the capitalist, the socialist, and the domestic markets. That was unquestionably a mistake. But it is also a fact that the socialist economy is something of a fictitious market, and in a fictitious market both competition and risk are fictitious, and even personal responsibility is fictitious.

[Nemeth] I fully share that opinion. This has such serious consequences that in our internal mechanism the clash of interests is still artificial. You have expressed this differently, by saying that the market and responsibility are fictitious. Yes, they are fictitious; the evaluation of performances is still not realistic—the state either adds or takes away. We are familiar with the complicated system of subsidies and withdrawals. This was what I referred to in my speech when I said that if we are going to maintain this system and do not develop the conditions for a genuine market economy—without any qualifying adjectives—as soon as possible, then we will be renouncing the most important motivating force, the influence of the market in creating demand and orientating our activities.

However clever a planning office may be, however clever a government or an economic management may be, they cannot substitute for the equilibrium-creating force of the market.

[Mester] Now, if that is the case, then in practice we have altered our goals and ideas, because if I understand you well, then the goal is not to reach the socialist market conditions but to get to the point where the economy functions amid real market conditions. Is that not so?

[Nemeth] Yes, this is so. The adjective "socialist" has to be sought not in the process of production but in distribution policy, in the process of the realization of interests, the handling of the conflicts of interests, and, let me add, to a certain extent, in respect to the standard of living policy and employment policy.

[Mester] But look, it is not me who you have to convince of this. You might find yourself in a position where you have to convince very high-ranking state or party leaders, and possibly not Hungarian state or party leaders. You will have to convince them that it is not the fundamental socialist idea that we are deviating from but merely bad practice.

[Nemeth] Our most important task is the construction of a market economy, both in the near and in the foreseeable longer-term future. This does not neglect the role of the plan or of planning, they merely get a different interpretation of the sort of economic system I have been speaking about. Planning and governmental influence must develop and think through—and preferably think through in different versions—the longer-term strategic conditions of economic and social policy. Then these versions must be put to society, so that it should be able to evaluate them and their advantages and disadvantages.

[Mester] Fine, the only problem is that this society has accepted over many years that under socialist conditions there cannot be income without work. Now we say that the content behind the word "performance" can have a wider interpretation, and can be applied to the case where someone begins to mobilize his private capital, or where we have capital flowing in from abroad, and we integrate it for socialist goals. There are those who are frightened by this idea.

[Nemeth] We are frightened because for 40 years, to use a rough figure, certain theses not validated by practice have become part of our conditioning to reexamine them, and even more to put them into practice, will not be an easy process. It will cause political and ideological problems as well. We have to think through—first and foremost on the basis of practice—what it is that we regard as work and as earnings based on work. Why is it not work, for example, if I invest my earnings, which I have worked for, in some activity or enterprise which operates at a good profit, if I take a certain risk—because, after all, it is possible that the enterprise will fail and then I will lose all my money—and perhaps gain income from the capital I have invested?

[Mester] Because this is not what we have said up to now. Also, there might be those who perhaps will begin to worry about excessive differences in income.

[Nemeth] The handling of the differences, that is, the prevention of the development of great differences in income, is something that the tax system will have to be able to deal with, the inheritance tax, for example. We must not introduce a market mechanism which from the outset acts as a brake to enterprise because of ideological considerations.

[Mester] You are 40 years old. I am not saying only 40 or already 40. This is, of course, a matter of attitudes. Public opinion has been able to follow your career only for a relatively short time. We know that for the last few years your leadership ambitions and your rapid appointments generally coincided. However, this is not characteristic in our country. I think that young people very well equipped for leadership in general receive leading posts rather late.

[Nemeth] During the past 30 years, of the three criteria—that is, political reliability, moral purity, and occupational skill—it is the occupational skill and aptitude which was most often neglected in the practice of our cadre policy. During the past 30 years, we have had mechanisms and a cadre policy which led to selection against talent. Let us admit that we have damaged ourselves by the tremendous number of decisions taken behind the scenes, by the postponement of cadre issues urgently in need of a solution.

[Mester] As a consequence of my work I know most of the members of the Politburo rather well; I can safely say that they are people with rather different temperaments, outlooks and interests. In your opinion, is this a good or a bad thing?

[Nemeth] In my opinion, the more colorful the individuals who make up a certain body, the more the work benefits. It also benefits decisions. In my view, this present body meets this requirement. It is so as regards the age distribution, as well as its ability and willingness to engage in debate.

[Mester] Last week I saw on television the match between the world team and the French national team and my sports reporter colleague said that when there are very well equipped, quality players in a team, the necessary team work can be developed quickly and easily. Well, I immediately thought of our national 11 because it is possible that this statement applies not only on the football field but also in politics, and perhaps it also applies as regards the political team called the Politburo.

[Nemeth] What we would like to attain—and we want to work out the mechanisms for attaining it—is that the Politburo, and even more the Central Committee, should be a debating body, one which shapes policy in substance and which prepares political decisions. For this we shall now have to make some changes in our own methods of work and work style. Well, what I have in mind, for example, is that we shall soon get to the situation where we obtain recommendations—what is more, recommendations which are thought out in a complex manner—for the solution to a certain specific question or problem, and that if, in the possession of these recommendations or concepts we find ourselves with two strong alternatives, then we should have the courage to take them to the Central Committee, and thereafter perhaps to public opinion as well. Let us not make decisions about the party or society, as regards the fate of the people, behind their backs. Let us bring the people into politics, let us ask for their views, let us evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of specific

decisions in public. We can outline more or less who the winners and the losers will be in the interest of various goals; after all, in a system of decision-making and with a political line such as I have tried to outline, this is certainly present and is something that we must not be silent about; rather we must speak about it.

[Mester] Well, if this is the ambition of the Politburo then it can be assumed that we journalists will also have more to do, and it is also certain that we shall have a greater responsibility, and perhaps it will happen less frequently that the role of whipping boy is given to the press than in the past few years. At least this is my view. I do not know that time-scale we can envisage. Perhaps this question is not even justified as yet. In your opinion, how much time is necessary for us to find out whether this is a winning team?

[Nemeth] Those who are hoping for a spectacularly quick turnaround here are either underestimating the problems and tensions which have accumulated—in other words, they do not know the facts—or they are chasing illusions. Even with a political line which imposes very tough, very strict requirements, the first favorable changes, signs, or results, can be hoped for in only 3 to 4 years. Thus, we shall have to be able to live through this period. I am afraid of mentioning even 3 or 4 years; nonetheless, my belief and my heart dictate that I should give a specific answer to your question.

It is not really the time-scale that is important here but rather that our people, our society should find in everyday life in more and more areas that there is a determination to eliminate the accumulated problems, to turn the situation around, with struggle and hard work, and if we do all this, then there will be a resurgence.

Pozsgay Address at MSZMP Conference Published

AU2905165388 Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET in Hungarian
22 May 88 pp 2-3

[Report on speech by PPF Secretary General Imre Pozsgay at the MSZMP National Conference on 21 May: "There Is Need for Dialogue With the Entire Nation"]

[Text] Imre Pozsgfay began his address by saying that after the so many intelligent words and important thoughts that have been expressed from this rostrum, those who still want to say something new and important find themselves in increasingly restricted positions. An increasing number of people profess the intention to change rather than coming up with new proposals, and we know how little value there is in those proposals and alternatives that are not supported by organized forces and organizations. The time is ripe to commit ourselves to the new organizational principles that shape the new qualitative unity amid debates, amid struggle of various trends, and amid a creative environment that protects the minority, rather than to assert the persistent and paralyzing requirements of unity. Deep convictions and the development of patience involving self-control and respect for other people's rights to independent thinking, while sufficient, are also indispensable. Where this unity is ritualistic and monolithic, it serves power rather than progress. At these places, debate becomes a demon and is called the enemy. Where this unity is creative, the debate is a means of renewal. Let us remember Engels' words that "it is part of every party's life and prosperity for more moderate as well as extremist trends to develop within its framework, and even for these trends to confront each other. Anyone who tries to do away with the more extremist tendencies only contributes to their growth."

Things Can Be Done Differently Too [subhead]

We are aware of the size of our problems and the main reasons for them. The party debates held in the spring and indications from society made us aware of the fact that, in addition to dissatisfaction, a feeling of responsibility and readiness for action was growing in the country. A particular process of awareness has developed among members and nonmembers of the party—a process that started with a consensus that the situation was negative and made it clear that things can no longer continue in the old way. This was soon followed by the declaration that party members and citizens want to participate in exercising power, and do not want to be merely the subject of decisions and executors of tasks decided without them and without their direct participation in the decision making process. People today reject the conditions under which they must be primarily responsible for implementing decisions, but are not allowed to participate in the decisions themselves—particularly when central decisions are involved.

In its complexity, Hungarian political life today shows signs of division. Precisely because of this, however, it also contains opportunities for progress. Today, in addition to dissatisfaction over the losses in the people's economy and in management, another factor contributes to the rejection of the existing conditions—the belief that things can be done differently. Naturally, this has brought a storm of criticism with it. Lack of confidence in the capacity of the regime's official institutions to function has been expressed unequivocally. The country has been resounding with calls for account and with demands for guarantees. However, let us analyze thoroughly what exactly was the real and general reason for our bad mood. I think that delay and helplessness were the main reasons for this mood. An uncertain existence and lack of prospects for the future only strengthened this bad mood. However, instead of causing resignation, the bitterness due to economic losses and loss of moral values led our society toward self-awareness. The people have carried out the change! The basic Leninist principle that government in the name of the people's interests must be replaced by government by the people is being carried out here and now.

The party members played an indispensable role in this change because, while as an organization the party lost prestige and there was a decline in confidence in the party, the members and nonmembers of the party—communists, the people, and the nation—have found each other. It has become clear, as so often has happened in the past, that they have nothing to fear from each other. The only thing to be feared is that the political sphere will see only the side effects of the quiet, but nonetheless revolutionary, changes and, instead of acting in a spirit of initiative capable of taking risks, the political sphere will act out of a reflex of preserving its power. I hope that, after the party conference, this fear will prove to be groundless.

A Socialist Society Built From Below [subhead]

What is it that both members and nonmembers of the party are aware of in Hungary? They are aware of the fact that we have exhausted all our reserves for dealing with catastrophes in the 20th century; we no longer have reserves for catastrophes. We have to live, and life must be better again sooner or later!

A new consensus is needed to achieve this goal. It is both a historical task for the Patriotic Front and a great opportunity for its own renewal to participate in the creation of this new consensus. To do this, a change in attitude is needed in several important areas. First of all, it is necessary to recognize and accept that, irrespective of party affiliation, the citizens have undertaken to create a socialist society built from below. Using Kossuth's words, a policy that does not oppose the inevitable, but accepts it, will be the winner. This also means that consensus in today's world cannot be achieved by agreements reached with some brilliant and powerful personalities instead of the people.There is need for a honest dialogue with the entire nation—a dialogue between the power and society that is divided into autonomous organizations. This requires that the social content of the consensus be clarified at a time when the current struggle is not over the distribution of surplus income resulting from consistent growth of national income, but about the sharing of losses and the acceptance of sacrifices. We must speak openly about who will be the winners and who will be the losers in this distribution, and why; we must speak openly about the way society or the government will compensate the losers. People who recognize long- or short-term possibilities in our program for solving their problems will participate in the new consensus. Next, this new consensus needs a program that does not confuse desires with reality and that recognizes facts as facts even if they contradict our hopes and desires. Our problems have often been caused by the fact that words and facts did not correspond to each other or with reality.

In preparing the new consensus, and in accordance with its mission, the PPF would support the renewal of constitutional conditions [kozjogi viszonyok], the reform of the Constitution and of the election law, the passage of a law on referendums and associations, and the establishment of a Constitutional Court and a Public Administration Court.

All of these taken together would ensure the division and control of power and the possibility of despotism and abuse of power would thus be organizationally and legally eliminated on all levels. The development of citizens' rights must go hand in hand with the development of constitutional conditions. The requirements for this are a sovereign legislature, a government that pursues an independent policy, strong self-government by local councils, and mature citizens capable of self-determination and acting as responsible masters of the country. Within this constitutional framework, the party will have a growing, instead of a decreasing role, as will the public organizations and movements which cooperate with the party autonomously and as partners, as well as the communities of citizens and organizations that promote interests and that function constitutionally and on the basis of the law of associations. In other words, to quote Mikhail Gorbachev—whose words are, after all, to our great pleasure in harmony with our endeavors—to the effect that with the joint effect of the "socialist constitutional state" and of "socialist pluralism," we can create socialism that is efficient and attractive and that is based on solidarity among the people, democracy, and the desire for initiatives. Although this socialism still remains a necessity, it is proceeding toward freedom.

There will be no stable conditions for accepting risks or for any changes in the economy, political system, and cultural life without renewing our constitutional conditions in a way that expresses our national traditions and expands and guarantees the citizens' rights, and without tightening up the legal framework of public service. A socialist constitutional state, or any constitutional state for that matter, is not the creation and necessity of a single social order, but the result of the progress of human civilization. People despise the law only where tyranny and despotism prevail. Wherever power is exercised with the approval of the people and the regime is thus legitimate—as in Hungary—the law is observed even if the authorities find it inconvenient and untimely. Only in this way can a society be cohesive. Marxist theory has bequeathed this guidance to us, the representatives of the people's power. It is regarded as a sign of a nation's decline when its citizens ignore the law. This usually happens where an uncontrollable state always interprets the law in its own interests and in an arbitrary way. We want to be a "rising nation"! The socialist constitutional state moves us closer to this goal. Otherwise, catching up economically with the more developed countries is a hopeless endeavor because a country that is unable to create order in its public life by means of democracy and freedom goes about in the world like a villager in a big city—he is confused and worried from the moment of arrival and suspects danger around every corner. Despite being "villagers, we do have the cultural, legal, and moral heritage as well as the background of

civilization to be able to feel at home in the world. Socialism can connect up with this background by accepting suitable criticism, but the connection will nonetheless be secure.

It Is Worth Being Hungarian [subhead]

A small country is kept alive by its openness to the world at large. Precisely for this reason, we must be aware of the world, but the world must also be aware of us. If we are not to lose our balance in this great activity, we must strengthen our national identity. For the time being, economic performance cannot be a foundation for our national self-esteem. However, the implementation of comprehensive reforms, the creation of greater freedom, and the construction of democratic socialism can definitely constitute such a foundation. This kind of situation would once again have international historical significance. Without any false pride or haughtiness, we could quite simply once again feel that the world would be poorer without us. We Hungarians in Hungary would strengthen the feeling among the Hungarians around the world that it is worthwhile being Hungarian in Csikszereda, Ungvar, Galanta, Kismarton, Ujvidek, New York, Buenos Aires, and Canberra....

It rarely occurs that the clock of Hungary's history and that of the world are synchronized. Now we have such a special occasion, and we should make good use of time. In this case, let Kossuth be wrong. He said that "there is a word that runs through the whole of Hungarian history like a red thread, and this word is 'late'".

We sense something extraordinary in the atmosphere at this conference. This feeling is indefinable, but it is exciting and full of surprises. Previously forbidden words can be heard at this conference. We lift our heads in surprise and see that these words are spoken by those who once forbade them, and, at such times, we would like to be silent. However, I rather believe in the power of words to bring about changes. It is said that a snake dies if it cannot shed its skin, and people die if they cannot change their opinions. Renewal needs adherents and millions who will cooperate, and for this people must be allowed to change.

We also sense a kind of settling of accounts in the air and the wind, as well as the torment and cruelty of the change of generations. We hear half-expressed thoughts and unmistakable allusions. Let us not blame the words and the speakers for the fact that all this is happening in such an ambiguous way, let us blame the conditions that led to the situation in which this is still the only way things can be done today. We can only stammer when we speak about the change of generations and the implementation of responsibility, because we have no valid words for things for which we have no valid institutional solutions. The determination of responsibility is part of any developed political style and a just requirement of citizens and members of parties. Nonetheless, I suggest now that we should carry out this calling to account together and in our souls, with each of us progressing to the point of his responsibility. Then, reconciled with ourselves, let us seek things in the preceding generation that are great and worthy of our respect. This is also part of our self-respect and beatitude. You are being told all this by me, a middle-aged political worker who has never received anything for free in politics and has always struggled for his real or presumed truth, and who has pursued his career during the 3 decades in which the preceding generation has been guiding the country. To deny this would be equivalent to self-mutilation.

The task upon which we are going to decide here is not a political one. It is more than that, it is historical. Now is the time to decide whether we will smash ourselves on our own barriers or whether we will smash the barriers. There can be no doubt about the answer. The conference debate confirms our faith: We can once again be a vanguard and there will be Hungarian development!

Moscow Dispatch on Summit Expectations

AU0106115088 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 28-29 May p 1

[Wieslaw S. Debski Moscow dispatch: "Removing Barriers"]

[Text] The temperature in Moscow and in the journalists' quarters is getting increasingly hot—over 25 centigrade—political discussions are getting increasingly lively, the statements made by the U.S. President and his aides are continuing to arrive hourly, and Soviet personalities and scientists keep on airing their views.

The most recent Soviet press commentaries have stressed that, as was the case before, people expect the Gorbachev-Reagan meeting to produce further progress in building up general security and in eliminating barriers to disarmament. Analyzing the present world situation, Vitaliy Kobysh, the MOVSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI commentator, notes that in the past few years people have understood not only that enormous amounts of nuclear weapons have been senselessly amassed, but also that these weapons can elude international control and fall into undesirable hands. That is why people are becoming increasingly concerned and the struggle for disarmament is becoming increasingly militant. All leaders must reckon with this mood.

Recent public opinion polls have shown that the Soviet people regard disarmament as the most important subject of the Moscow talks and that they expect the summit to accelerate the preparation of the treaty on the 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear missiles and to prevent the introduction of nuclear weapons into space.

However, Moscow preparations indicate that other subjects will also be discussed. Actually, the most important of these subjects are already being discussed: The participants in the Afghanistan war have met with journalists in the Press Center, and the press continues to devote much space to human rights and to how these rights are realized in the United States. These issues will occupy an important place in the summit talks.

It is not only press commentaries that herald the coming summit. Life in journalists' quarters is becoming increasingly bustling. I have been told that by Friday evening almost 5,000 journalists, including 1,000 U.S. ones, arrived in Moscow.

Ronald Reagan will live in the residence of the U.S. ambassador, which is a small palace situated in an attractive and quiet part of Moscow, about 1 mile away from the Kremlin. MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI continues to write about some of the summit events, the most important of which will be a dinner in honor of Mikhail Gorbachev. This dinner will be attended by 125 guests.

'Cautious Optimism' About Summit

AU0106141588 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 30 May 88 pp 1, 6

[Report by Moscow correspondent Jerzy Kraszewski: "Dialogue Is a Requirement of the Times"]

[Text] On the eve of the fourth summit and on the day of the start of talks, Moscow was ruled by cautious optimism, a determination to continue dialogue, and an aim to make this dialogue a permanent feature of the relations between the two states. Commentaries in the Saturday and Sunday editions of Moscow papers and in radio and television programs recalled that in the past 3 years the deadlock has been broken and more has been achieved than was expected.

The optimism is cautious, because the United States has not ceased to be a difficult partner, and the process of restructuring its foreign policy is proceeding slowly and in zigzags.

Nevertheless, the Soviet media are stressing not the obstacles, but the objective necessity of dialogue. "No one today needs to be convinced that the very continuation of Soviet-American top-level dialogue is extremely important," wrote PRAVDA. "This dialogue is a requirement of the times. It encourages an enhancement of detente and a consolidation of world security." The CPSU Central Committee organ concluded that "if the Moscow summit's participants succeed in raising dialogue to a new level, this alone will be a major contribution to detente and peace in the world."

At the same time, it is observed that parallel to the expansion and enhancement of dialogue on the subject of disarmament, regional conflicts, and humanitarian issues, there is a clear revival of bilateral cooperation, though it has still not encompassed the principal spheres of economic life. The conclusion of several new agreements is foreseen during the U.S. President's current visit.

However, the Soviet press gives prominence to the view that the meeting ought to focus on problems of disarmament and security. A ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will surely be a good omen.

Other Moscow papers have written in a similar vein. IZVESTIYA: "Moscow is awaiting Ronald Reagan with genuine wishes for open dialogue, based on a feeling of responsibility, on the subject of a broad range of international problems—global, regional, and bilateral." KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: "Today, when the President of the United States is coming to Moscow, we have every reason to believe that dialogue between the USSR and United States could and should become a major source of positive changes in the world. Experience shows that every summit meeting so far has generated processes of improving the international situation."

Siwicki, Baryla Receive USSR's Lizichev
LD0106194888 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1730 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] A delegation of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, led by Army General Aleksey Lizichev, is staying in Poland. The forms and methods of educational and political work were discussed with the party political aktiv of the Polish Army.

The Soviet delegation visited the Silesian military district and also the 10th Tank Division named after the heroes of the Soviet Army, where a soldier's rally of friendship and brotherhood of arms was held.

Today Army General Aleksey Lizichev was received by PZPR Central Committee Secretary Jozef Baryla. The delegation was also received by Army General Florian Siwicki, minister of national defense.

Orzechowski Interviewed on Relations With FRG
AU0106071188 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 26 May 88 pp 1, 9, 11

[Interview with Foreign Minister Marian Orzechowski by RZECZPOSPOLITA staffer Maria Wagrowska: "Looking To The Future"—date and place not given]

[Text] [Wagrowska] Minister, the state of relations between Poland and the FRG is causing a great deal of interest, and not just in Poland and the FRG. This interest is also expressed in that part of the communique on your official Moscow visit that refers to German issues. What do you think the sources of this phenomenon are?

[Orzechowski] This interest is natural, and there are many reasons for it. Polish-FRG relations possess a European dimension, as Polish-German relations always have. This is because of the two countries' demographic, economic, and cultural potential, as well as their geographical and strategic situation, their place and role in the military-political alliances, and their proximity.

Postwar experience has fully confirmed all this. No serious constructive talks on Europe, on its present and future, have been possible without the participation of Poland, the FRG, and the GDR. It is enough to recall how important the establishment of friendly, good-neighborly relations between Poland and the GDR has been for European peace and security.

Polish-FRG relations have always been a product of the European situation and climate, but have also influenced this situation and climate.

The agreement on the normalization of Polish-FRG relations paved the way to Helsinki and the CSCE. Today, one cannot talk about Europe's present and future and the building of a "common European home" without a energetic and constructive contribution from Poland and the FRG. Both states are major components of the European structure of forces. Any talk about Europe's political countenance will always be one-sided if there is no mention of Polish-FRG relations.

I am convinced that both sides realize this. This realization expresses a real social need and conforms to the changes that have taken place in the attitudes of Poles and Germans thanks to the policy of close cooperation and friendship between Poland and the GDR, and the process of normalizing relations with the FRG since the 1970 treaty.

The 50th anniversary of the outbreak of World War II is approaching. This anniversary could become the beginning of a new chapter in Polish-West German relations. Poland has said many times that this 50th anniversary should serve as a "look to the future" and encourage accord and cooperation.

[Wagrowska] Minister, in your press statements prior to the visit by FRG Vice Chancellor and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher to Warsaw in January, you hoped that "qualitative progress" would occur in Polish-West German relations. Minister Genscher himself said at a press conference that both sides are aiming for a "breakthrough," and that a visit by Chancellor Helmut Kohl should lead to it. You will probably go to Bonn at the beginning of July. Do you think there is a chance of a real "breakthrough" in relations with the FRG?

[Orzechowski] There has been and still is a "growing deficit" in Polish-FRG relations. Both sides know it. But they also feel the need to improve the political climate and accelerate the development of mutual relations, which has been sluggish in recent years.

During H-D Genscher's visit, we agreed to undertake an intensive effort to break the deadlock, clear the "front yard," and animate cooperation in all basic spheres of relations. We also defined a precise path leading to this objective. Is this path leading to "qualitative progress" or even a breakthrough in Polish-FRG relations? Time will provide an answer to this. What is most important is that both sides realize that this is essential, also for the interests of all of Europe.

[Wagrowska] So what are the immediate prospects of a development of relations with the FRG?

[Orzechowski] Normalization and accord between Poland and the FRG require firm supporting pillars. Not even the most beautiful-sounding words and declarations can take the place of these pillars.

As usual, Warsaw is listening to the declarations and assurances carefully and in good faith. However, it has always considered deeds to be a confirmation of words. It is the same this time. What is needed is concrete activity, which would add new, positive substance to mutual relations. A clear political desire is necessary, but

this desire has to be documented by means of political decisions. Only then can we be sure that the work of the three Polish-West German working teams that were formed as a result of the visit will be successful.

One of these teams is dealing with mutual political problems, another with economic and financial problems, and the third with mutual cooperation in disarmament. As we know, these teams have already held their first meetings. They will hold further meetings in May. The experts are trying to translate into the language of concrete accords and agreements the will and intentions of both sides expressed during Minister Genscher's visit and stemming from the letter and spirit of the 7 December 1970 treaty.

One must admit that the work of these teams is not easy. There are still many obstacles and difficulties on the road to normalizing relations with the FRG. But there is no rational alternative. Passiveness and waiting will achieve nothing. The philosophy of "new thinking" should also encompass Polish-FRG relations. I believe that the future work of these mixed teams will be encouraged by the political climate, which is characterized by both sides' desire to find satisfactory solutions.

During my Bonn visit, which is planned for July, we will together assess the progress this work has achieved. We will adopt suitable decisions on this basis.

[Wagrowska] Your visit will precede a visit to Poland by Chancellor Kohl, which has also been announced for this year.

[Orzechowski] Yes. We consider my visit to be an important stage in preparing for Chancellor Kohl's Polish visit. We assume this visit will lead to a tangible increase in the substance of mutual relations.

The visit by Chancellor Kohl, who is also head of the CDU, cannot be viewed as just another routine visit. It cannot be a mere political gesture. It ought to express a real improvement in the relations between both states and peoples. It will have served its purpose when a real breakthrough in the present difficult relations occurs. We believe this breakthrough is completely feasible.

[Wagrowska] There are three working groups in a situation where each side has its own catalog of postulates, which do not necessarily coincide with those of the other side. For example, the West German side is tackling such issues as youth exchanges, the setting up of a culture institute, the development of interpersonal relations, emigration to the FRG, and the cultivation of German culture and language in Poland and the tending of German graves there. Out of all this, what is acceptable to us?

[Orzechowski] At the start of talks it is normal for each side's stance to be different and even completely opposed. Overcoming these differences and reaching joint solutions that take into account not just one's own needs and interests, but also those of the partner, is a fundamental part of diplomacy. As we know, politics is also the art of attaining what is possible. There is no point in indulging in any public speculation before the teams have completed their work. This would not be conducive to an agreement.

The Polish side will remain faithful to the principle whereby the work of the teams is confidential.

[Wagrowska] Do you think an agreement and a future rapprochement with the FRG is at all possible if Bonn is constantly talking about the so-called German legal positions?

[Orzechowski] This is a key issue. Real accord between states and peoples can only be built on permanent foundations.

In Polish-German relations, such foundations are provided by the border on the Odra and Nysa rivers, agreed on in Potsdam and confirmed by Poland's 1950 treaty with the GDR and 1970 treaty with the FRG.

Our legal positions, if that is what you can call them, are unchanging and cannot be undermined. They recognize the reality of the Europe of today. We believed and continue to believe that they form the basis of any talks on the future of Europe and are a point of departure for new relations between states and peoples that are full of mutual confidence. This approach is one of the pillars on which Poland has based its European politics.

The so-called German legal positions do not take reality into account. As we know, they are based on a recognition that the prewar German reich still exists within its 1937 borders. Therefore, you are right that the FRG's legal stance is different from Poland's. These differences are causing major difficulties for mutual relations. For example, they are preventing many agreements and harming the interests of the citizens of both countries.

The so-called German legal positions involve more than just borders. They also involve rules about German nationality and the "concept of a German," and serve as a base on which to construct myths about a multimillion-strong German minority in Poland. Automatically included in this minority are not only former citizens of the Reich (in other words, Poles as well!), but also their children and children's children (and, in certain cases, their spouses).

As a historian, I cannot help thinking that if the Third Reich has inherited the legal position of the Weimar Republic or German Empire, then perhaps one also ought to look for German legal positions in New Guinea or in Cameroon, whose first black president was called Nicolas Grunitzky.

Only in this context does it become obvious how destructive the German legal positions are for Polish-FRG relations. They pose a constant threat to these relations and sow a climate of distrust. Whether they want to or not, the Poles will have to sign a declaration about the inviolability of borders and so on, together with other declarations saying that the 1970 treaty cannot forestall the stance and decisions of a future united Germany, that the areas east of the Odra and Nysa rivers are "German eastern provinces," and so on. This is how the German legal positions are blocking the solution of specific issues connected with place-names, citizenship, the "concept of German," and so on.

Can one neutralize these differences, seeing that one cannot remove them? I think one can! After all, such a state of affairs cannot continue indefinitely if one really wants normalization and accord instead of just saying one wants it.

The so-called German legal positions cannot undermine the 7 December 1970 treaty. I agree with FRG President Weizsaecker that the political requirement of an FRG accord with Poland takes precedence over legal structures. Of course, one can create ideology out of these structures and make them a subject of propaganda and a tool of politics. But then they poison the atmosphere and raise the temperature surrounding difficult unsolved matters. But one can also approach them in a pragmatic and far-sighted way. Then it becomes possible to remove the friction between legal standpoints and the solution of concrete affairs.

[Wagrowska] Recently, we have been hearing more and more about an "open German question," about "German unity" in a political sense (a united Germany) or nationalistic sense ("one people.") How does Poland view all this?

[Orzechowski] Allow me to quote what Wojciech Jaruzelski said about this at the "Jablonna 5" conference with foreign journalists on 28 November 1984: "Historically, the German question was solved by Adolf Hitler. He deleted 70 years of achievements by a united German people. He turned the very word 'unification' into a form of terror against all European peoples, not to mention governments, even though not all of them admit it."

Historically, the German question has also been solved by the Yalta and Potsdam decisions and the postwar course of events. Germany was defeated and divided into occupation zones. By decision of the victors and to the satisfaction of the whole of Europe, Prussia was abolished once and for all in 1947. The policy of the Western powers led first to the emergence of a dual-zone and triple-zone area, and then to the FRG. The GDR was founded. The fortunes of postwar Germany developed on two levels. It was still possible to halt this development. A united, democratic, peaceful, and neutral Germany was still within reach. The West held the key to such a Germany; it lay in the hands of the "old chancellor" Konrad Adenauer. It is he who rejected every chance, every realistic proposal, concerning such a united Germany. At that time, it was still possible to talk of a peace treaty with Germany. To do so today would be not only absurd, but dangerous fiction.

[Wagrowska] Nevertheless, the issue keeps cropping up in the FRG.

[Orzechowski] Referring to Germany's future, the Potsdam Agreement does not talk of a "peace treaty," but a "peace settlement," as opposed to the Third Reich's former allies, with whom the Agreement does talk of "peace treaties."

Postwar events on German soil lead one to the firm conclusion that such a "peace settlement" occurred a long time ago. For what are the following if not "peace settlements": the emergence of two German states and their subsequent acceptance into the United Nations; the FRG treaties with the socialist countries; the FRG-GDR treaty; the four-power agreement on West Berlin; and the CSCE Final Act; which was also signed by the two German states?

The two sovereign German states are also an integral part of European reality and a major component of European politics, political stabilization, security, and cooperation. They are an undeniable part of what we commonly call European reality.

Poland and, fortunately for Europe, not just Poland, does not agree and never will agree to a questioning and undermining of the postwar peaceful order.

This view is shared by the second sovereign German state—the GDR. It is not without reason that GDR State Council Chairman Erich Honecker, underlining the systemic differences between the two states, said this during his 1987 visit to the FRG: "One cannot combine fire and water." This does not rule out the development of normal, good-neighborly relations between the two German states. Real conditions for such relations would be provided by a constructive approach from the FRG toward the well-known GDR stance presented by E. Honecker in Gera.

The constitutional principle of unification is the FRG's business. No one can forbid any state to nurture its own hopes. However, the situation is different when these hopes harm other nations. When these hopes are unattainable and impossible to fulfill, they become doubly dangerous.

So much for the political aspects of the so-called German question. Its nationalistic aspect—"one people"—is not really part of politics, but of sociology and psychology. Discussing whether or not Germans in the GDR and Germans in the FRG are one and the same people is not politics.

The history of German speakers in Europe tells us that the process of national separation or integration normally lasts centuries (let me mention the internal breakup of the German states from the 1648 Peace of Westfalia until Bismarck's unification of the Reich in 1870), and that the appearance of separate states (Austria, Switzerland, Luxembourg, Liechtenstein) is always a starting point and encouragement for these processes.

On a historical scale, the almost 40 years of the existence of a separate FRG and GDR is too short a period in which to firmly say "yes" or "no." This question must be left to history and to the self-awareness of the Germans.

[Wagrowska] We often hear about "excessive Polish sensitivity" or even a "Polish allergy" to anything on the subject of Germany, something that sets us apart from the other socialist states. How is this in reality?

[Orzechowski] It is difficult to talk of any all-pervading "Polish sensitivity," even though anyone who survived the war and the relatives of those who did not have every right to be sensitive.

Of course, the past, and the historical conditions which we all know about, make Poland particularly sensitive to all aspects of FRG politics and to all its theories and doctrines that conflict with our interests and do not correspond to the interests of detente, stabilization, and European cooperation. This clearly confirmed by the results of polls conducted by the Public Opinion Research Center.

When we compare the attitude of Poland with that of other socialist countries, we can easily see that there are differences. The West German legal positions affect Poland and the GDR more than anyone else. They lead to the myth about a "multimillion-strong German minority in Poland." Our Western lands are described in the FRG as "German eastern territory" or, at the very best, "former German eastern territory." Every socialist state has experienced World War II, but each state has done so differently, in different political constellations, and with different results.

In other words, varying relations with Germany and a different past mean that, in talks with the FRG, each socialist state places the accents in different places. Whoever fails to see these differences and the consequences of them cannot understand much about Polish-German relations in general and Polish-FRG relations in particular. But, at the same time, all the socialist countries share a common danger posed by a violation of the European territorial-political order and a disturbing of the balance of forces between East and West.

It is of singular, even fundamental, importance that our view of relations with the FRG and the difficulties therein coincide with that of the Soviet Union.

At the roots of this convergence lies a common experience of the painful and tragic past and a communion of goals, in other words, the building of a "common European home" sitting on the firm foundations of European reality.

Poland has accepted the following stance of Mikhail Gorbachev, presented at the end of last year, with all due attention and approval: "We invite the government and politicians of the FRG to establish relations on the basis of a respect for the postwar reality. If they are ready to do so, they may create great possibilities for developing political dialogue and economic, scientific, cultural, and other relations between the two countries." Poland fully supports such a platform on which to establish relations with the FRG.

[Wagrowska] What we are now talking about is closely connected with the moral aspect of relations between Poles and Germans, and between Poland and the FRG. For example, following Minister Genscher's visit, the FRG press commented favorably on what you said about the German displaced persons and on Genscher's laying a wreath on the grave of a German soldier who died in World War I. Does the moral aspect of relations involve nothing more than that?

[Orzechowski] You have touched upon an exceedingly delicate and difficult matter. Even though so much time has elapsed since the last world war, the moral aspect of relations with the FRG is still alive. It also appeared during Minister Genscher's visit. It is he who said that the moral quality of FRG foreign policy is tested in its relations with Poland. However, I referred to the moral dimension of mutual relations, albeit more extensively and somewhat differently from the way in which the FRG press presented it.

The moral aspects of Polish-German relations and of relations between the Germans and the Poles were and remain a heritage of the tragic past. This cannot be eradicated. The wounds inflicted by the past have still not healed. They are setting with difficulty. Whether we want to or not, the past is helping to shape present and future relations between the Poles and the Germans. It forms a part of these relations. However, we do not want it to act as a burden and drag us backwards. But not everything depends on us, and not chiefly on us.

In the FRG, much as been said and written about overcoming the past.

We welcome and share Chancellor Kohl's words that "Germany cannot forget, dismiss, or play down the Hitlerite atrocities, because only by remembering them do we become capable of a rapprochement."

The words of FRG President Richard von Weizsaecker also arouse our esteem: "Germany cannot escape from the burden of the past and cannot forget it—for its own good."

However, we are disturbed and become distrustful when we hear and see how many Germans are, in fact, escaping to the past and forgetting it, employing the excuse "It wasn't us, it was our forebears!" Playing down the Hitlerite past, diminishing Hitler's responsibility for the outbreak of World War II, and rejecting the truth about the genocide is a real and actual manifestation of "overcoming the past," although, fortunately, it is not widespread. The debate of West German historians on this subject in recent years has been enlightening. This debate was an attempt to diminish and even erase Germany's responsibility for the tragedy of World War II.

Such an "overcoming of the past" continues to pervade periodicals, books, films, the theater, schools, and universities to this very day. We see clear signs of this in many school textbooks, whose authors seem never to have heard of joint Polish-German agreements.

The way in which the "past is overcome" in the FRG and the way in which young people are brought up there makes us wonder if the second and third generations of Germans in the FRG are already free of the burden of the past when looking not only at their own national goals, but also when viewing us, Poland and the Poles, and Polish-German relations yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

The tragic past provides special imperatives concerning the attitude of FRG Germans vis-a-vis Poland and the Polish people. In any case, that is what we think in Poland, and that is how we interpret the speeches of many distinguished West German politicians apart from the ones I mentioned, men like G. Heinemann, W. Scheel, and W. Brandt.

[Wagrowska] You have been speaking about the Germans. However, to what extent does this also apply to us, to Poles? Can we also talk about the moral aspects of our attitude toward Germany and the Germans?

[Orzechowski] We can, and we should! We have also had "to overcome the past" in our attitude toward Germany and the Germans. The legacy of the past, the threat from the West to Polish statehood from its very beginnings, Prussia's involvement in the Polish partitions, Germanization in the Prussian sector, Bismarck and the Kulturkampf, the operation of a Nazi "fifth column" in Poland before World War II, and the fate of Poles and Jews during the Nazi occupation made Poles' conception of the history of our relations with the Germans one of "a thousand-year struggle," of "bad neighborliness." It is significant that the first book on Polish-German relations to appear after the war (it was written during the occupation by Z. Wojciechowski, the outstanding historian and specialist in Polish-German affairs) bore the title "Poland-Germany: A Thousand Years of Struggle." It was not easy for us, the generation of Poles who lived through the occupation, to view Germany and the Germans differently and to perceive another Germany and different Germans. Every one of us of that generation, which had been deprived of a childhood and whose youth had been wasted, saw Germans as, above all, a mortal enemy, invaders, occupiers, and murderers.

The process of personal reevaluation and discovering another Germany and different Germans was not easy. It was accompanied by moral doubts and recurrent uncertainty.

Many Poles even viewed the emergence of the GDR with mistrust, reservations, and doubts. Many people doubted whether there could be another Germany. I remember my own experiences well—my first meeting after the war with Germans from the GDR. This was in the summer of 1950. They included communists and, quite simply, anti-fascists. They were precisely those "other Germans" that I had not known before. They also included people who had been resettled, people who had lived in Zgorzelec, on our side of the border, and had left behind their homes and native surroundings.

It was the GDR, its attitude toward the past of its own people, especially the Nazi past, toward Poland and the Poles that enabled us, to a large extent, to overcome the stereotype of the "thousand-year struggle" and "bad neighborliness," and view Germany, the Germans, and Polish-German relations in a new way. The GDR also made a serious effort to "overcome the past." We did not have any problems with associations of expellees there, although millions were also resettled in the GDR. In contrast to the GDR, the FRG did not make it easy for us to change our attitude toward Germany and the Germans. The history of this is well known, but this is not the place nor the time to recall it. But we soon noticed that there are also "other Germans" in the FRG.

We view with enormous satisfaction and relief every sign of realism and change in attitudes toward Poland and the Poles. We never divided Germany into the "good" (the GDR) and the "bad" (the FRG), and we never divided the Germans into the "good" (those from the GDR) and the "bad" (those from the FRG). The principle of realism and fair judgment always guided our attitude toward Germany and the Germans.

[Wagrowska] Does this also apply to our view of the fate of those Germans who were expelled from the Odra and Baltic regions? The reports that appeared in the West German press following Minister Genscher's visit gave one the impression that what you said on this subject was surprising or even sensational in the eyes of the West German side.

[Orzechowski] There can be no question of surprises or sensations. Perhaps you remember that in a speech made on 7 May 1985 in Wroclaw, Wojciech Jaruzelski said that many Germans found it painful to leave their homes and that it is understandable that resettlement was sometimes accompanied by human suffering. He also recalled that the German nation's best sons were Hitler's

first victims. So, we have not closed and do not close our eyes to the horrors of war, and to the suffering and losses that the Germans themselves also experienced.

The expulsion of the Germans living in Poland was a political and national necessity. After the experiences of the war and the occupation these two ethnic communities could not live alongside one another. The Big Three came to this conclusion very early on, during the war itself. Let us remember that the actual architect of the resettlement of the German population in Poland was Winston Churchill, the British prime minister at the time. The decisions made at Potsdam sanctioned this idea.

It is also worth recalling that there were no outbursts of hatred and revenge attacks on Germans when the Polish authorities took over the Odra, Nysa, Luzyce, and Baltic regions. This could have happened, when you remember what the Germans did to us, how they expelled Poles from Wielkopolska and Pomorze, and when what they did in the General Governement was still fresh in people's minds. The manner in which the Germans were expelled was what Poland could afford during the period just after the war. Conditions were not easy. I think that objective confirmation of this is provided not only by the opinions of the British, who received arrivals destined for the British occupation sector, but also by the hundreds of opinions expressed by Germans who supervised the transportation—statements expressing these views are kept in, for example, the Wroclaw Voivodship State Archive, and some of them were published some years ago by Polish historians.

Even at that time, we knew that this harsh political and national necessity was accompanied by painful experiences for those who were expelled which were psychologically traumatic. The very personal experiences of Germans who were expelled from Poland, their memories and feelings, their nostalgia for their lost "dearer fatherland" and their homeland were never considered by us to be a pretext for suspicions or accusations of revisionism or nationalism. We never considered the millions who were resettled in the FRG or the GDR to be enemies of Poland, and we never identified them with the so-called professional expellees who direct the extensive network of associations of expellees. However, we always have acted and we always will act against the exploitation of feelings to conduct a bad policy, to use people's experiences as a tool for a revisionist, anti-Polish policy, which is something that the leaders of the expellee associations, to mention just the "old guard" of Mr Hupka and Czaja, have done from the very beginning, and which is something that the "new guard" of the Mr Koschyk type are also doing.

So, we remember the fate of the expellees. However, what we remember above all is the martyrdom of the Polish people, the incomparable losses and torments that we suffered at the hands of the Nazis. No one can place the sufferings and misfortunes of the victims of Nazi crimes and aggression on the same moral plane as the situation in which those who committed such vile deeds, approved of them, or those who were silent but participated in them or were witness to them found themselves, by saying that they are "settling accounts with respect to wrongs" or acting in the name of some false idea of humanitarism.

[Wagrowska] There is one more question, or perhaps doubt would be more accurate, that arises in connection with the moral aspects of Polish-German relations. West German press reports suggest that the Polish side has not done anything with regard to compensation for Polish victims of Nazi persecution, including those people who were used as forced labor. Is this true?

[Orzechowski] Surely there is no doubt that we could not fail to talk about an issue that exists, about something that is a very painful legacy of the occupation and concerns millions of people, of whom about 800,000 are still alive.

The fate of millions of Poles who were used as slaves is not just a political or legal issue. It is a moral problem, above all, and everything else stems from this. In talking about this, one cannot, of course, pass over in silence the fate of thousands and thousands of young Polish men and women who became modern-day slaves, who suffered irreversible psychological traumas and illnesses that manifest themselves over 20, 30, 40 years. This cannot be formulated in a law or expressed in an accountant's calculations.

The affair cannot be forgotten as long as those who have inherited the past of the German nation and the Third Reich, of the war and occupation years remain silent, do not overcome this past, and do not acknowledge all the socioeconomic, political, and psychological effects of the crimes committed against the Polish nation.

The combines that made millions with slave labor, with work that was severely damaging to health, remain silent.

Some of the main political parties remain silent and employ the tactics of legal loopholes or declarations that are not followed up with deeds, as if they do not realize that thousands of people who are still alive feel that they have been wronged and discriminated against.

They feel particularly wronged and discriminated against to this very day when they learn that the FRG wanted to and could settle such affairs in an entirely different way with respect to Jews, the citizens of many Western states, and even with Poles who became citizens of Western states. They cannot understand why some are "better" and others are "worse." They know perfectly well that the question of war reparations has nothing to do with their affair.

[Wagrowska] With your permission, I would now like to raise another issue. In your opinion, can we count on there being a normalization of credit and financial relations with the FRG?

[Orzechowski] The FRG is still Poland's main economic partner in the West.

The current state and level of economic relations is still very far from satisfactory. They do not meet needs and expectations, and also fail to exploit the possibilities that exist in both countries. Financial and credit relations have not been normalized yet. During the period 1986-87 there was a serious decline in trade (it fell by about 22 percent). The structure of trade is still poor (Poland mainly exports raw materials and the FRG exports relatively few items of machinery and equipment and a lot of intermediate products).

We realize that we are also partly to blame for this—I am thinking of the rather poor quality of some of our goods and the relatively meagre range of products. In practice this means that Poland must pay money for imports of goods for investment purposes This means that only about 15 percent of our imports are financed with commercial and bank loans that are not guaranteed. These limitations, which are not, as a rule, applied in international trade, have a decisive impact on our opportunities of engaging in economic cooperation with the FRG. Incidentally, I would like to stress that our other Western partners display a greater readiness and more flexibility in providing credits to finance exports to Poland.

As far back as 1986, the FRG Government decided to grant Poland credit guarantees amounting to DM100 million. This was meant to be the first, modest expression of the normalization of credit cooperation. However, the guarantees have only covered DM8.1 million worth of exports. Shortly afterwards, the FRG withheld the guarantees. This decision is still in force.

The burden imposed by discharging financial commitments is a serious problem for Poland. The FRG is our largest creditor. During the period 1982-87, Poland paid the FRG $1,411,000,000 dollars, of which $300 million was for guaranteed credits and $1,111,000,000 was for commitments toward commercial banks that were not guaranteed. Please just compare the modest sum of DM8.1 million with the amount for which guarantees were granted and then withheld by the FRG. There is an enormous and striking difference!

It is hard to imagine how the Polish economy will be able to discharge its financial commitments toward the FRG normally in a situation in which trade is limited, there are few opportunities for credit financing of imports, the range of industrial cooperation is becoming narrower, and we are being systematically pressed against a wall and being told: First of all, pay us hundreds of millions of dollars or marks, and then we will consider granting you credits or credit guarantees for several million or several tens of millions. This is a deadly philosophy for us, and thus we cannot accept it.

[Wagrowska] So, in view of this, what prospects are there for stepping up economic cooperation?

[Orzechowski] The expansion of economic cooperation and the normalization of financial and credit relations play a special role in our concept of normalization and agreement with the FRG. For us, progress in this area is an essential condition for achieving success in other areas.

In our relations with the FRG, we are counting on a greater coordination of concrete matters and, in particular, on better coordination of the extent of economic and financial cooperation and the rate at which it develops with the substance of other areas of cooperation.

We note statements made by West German politicians and business figures that indicate that there is interest in stepping up cooperation with us in solving Poland's difficult economic problems.

We interpret these statements as expressing a readiness on the part of the FRG to make a contribution—one that will benefit both sides—to the modernization of the Polish economy and the acceleration of Poland's economic development, and being an expression of a realistic and farsighted idea of economic relations with Poland. This is bold and long-term thinking that also takes account of the implications of long-term trends in the development of our country's economic cooperation with all its partners.

Today we are concerned about concrete, tangible facts. I am thinking of two basic matters.

First; the FRG's constructive involvement (as our largest creditor) in the long-term and realistic regulation of the repayment of Poland's guaranteed debts. One cannot call for essential help for Poland to be able to remain stable and develop (and repay its debts!) while, at the same time, tightening the noose "around its neck."

Second: genuine, long-term, and mutually advantageous FRG involvement in supporting restructuring and modernizing processes in the Polish economy.

In the light of this kind of understanding of economic cooperation, problems connected with the 1975 so-called jumbo credit, that is to say, the provision of limited guaranteed credits, assumes an entirely different dimension. They become just temporary matters, connected with the present and the near future.

[Wagrowska] As you noted at the beginning of our conversation, European issues are becoming an increasingly important element in Polish-West German relations. I have two questions connected with this. First, do you think that concrete cooperation between Poland and the FRG is possible in the security field, primarily in matters of such current important as reductions in tactical and conventional weapons? Second, what kind of philosophy of cooperation should guide us in this?

[Orzechowski] On many occasions Poland has stressed the positive role that the FRG can and ought to play in multilateral dialogue on security, cooperation, and disarmament in Europe. We demonstrated this in the past by proposing talks with the FRG on the subject of the Rapacki Plan in 1958. The absence of diplomatic relations was no obstacle to discerning and valuing the importance of the FRG's involvement in improving security in Europe. Recently, we have also appreciated the role played by the FRG in helping to bring about the Soviet-American agreement on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles (the Pershing Ia matter).

We also see great opportunities for concrete cooperation between the PPR and the FRG with respect to the range of proposals contained in the Jaruzelski Plan, the implementation of the CSCE Final Act, and the joint disarmament proposals made by the Warsaw Pact states. This applies, in particular, to reducing the number of conventional and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, the implementation of new confidence-building measures, and discussion on military doctrine, including criteria for determining defense sufficiency. These are all possibilities for joint thought about Polish proposals to give the European Council a truly universal European character and about the protection of the natural environment.

The last talks that we held showed that there is much common ground. This applies particularly to the moves that have followed the Washington treaty with respect to nuclear weapons in Europe and reductions in conventional weapons and forces on our continent in order to achieve military stability. We think that this marks the beginning of a certain process that might lead to the continual expansion of the basis for reaching mutual agreement. Dialogue and cooperation in the international sphere ought to complement and enrich the development of mutual relations.

Poland would like to base its relations with the FRG on the philosophy of a "common European home." Without Poland and the FRG, without normal relations and cooperation, this home will not only be poorly constructed but will also be a fiction without constructive and equal relations between the two German states. The GDR and the FRG also belong to the "common European home."

We not only need each other, Europe also needs us. We note with satisfaction the increased interest in this vision in the FRG. We think that the principles of good-neighborliness ought to apply equally to all the inhabitants of the "common European home." They have already been set out in many legally binding international documents, including the treaty between the PPR and the FRG signed in 1970.

What this means is that, as we are living together, no one should undertake anything that could endanger the security of the whole European home, which has been erected with such difficulty, or could damage the feeling of security of any of its occupants.

[Wagrowska] Thank you, Mr Minister.

Writers Appeal to Jaruzelski for PEN Club

LD0106143788 Hamburg DPA in German
1147 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] Warsaw (DPA)—One hundred and fifty-one Polish authors and academics have called on head of Party and State, General Wojciech Jaruzelski and Marshal of the Sejm Roman Malinowski to support the removal of hinderances to reviving the Polish PEN Club. The PEN Club has been practically suspended for 7 years since the imposition of martial law. In an open letter which became known to Western correspondents in Warsaw today, they appeal to both politicians to support the calling of a plenary meeting of PEN Club members so that a new executive can be elected.

To call this meeting the former executive should be recognized de facto. The authorities are sticking to the position that this executive should no longer be allowed to hold office. Instead of this they have set up an administration of commissars which is, however, not recognized by the writers. In their open letter, the writers point to the absurdity of the situation, which is damaging Polish culture and Poland's reputation in the world. The former executive had been elected legally in accordance with PEN's international statutes. Its members were ready to put their mandate to fresh elections by the general meeting called by them. It is important that all attempts by the administration to exercise pressure or to interfere in the PEN Club's affairs cease.

Ceausescu Chairs PEC Meeting on Pay Increases

AU0106202088 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1825 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] Bucharest AGERPRES 1/6/1988—A meeting of the Executive Political Committee of the CC of the RCP was held on Wednesday, June 1, under the chairmanship of Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party.

The Executive Political Committee examined proposals for pay rises in over 1988-1989 [sentence as received].

Worked out in line with the resolutions of the Thirteenth Congress and the National Conference of the RCP, the proposals for rises in the pay of the working personnel once again powerfully attest to the constant care the party and the state shows for the continuous growth in the whole people's material and spiritual standards.

Approving of the respective measures, the Executive Political Committee decided that the working personnel's pay should be increased by ten percent in 1988. This important drive, to start on August 1, 1988, will be concluded in the second half of next year. It was agreed that pays be raised in a phased-out manner. So, in a first stage, over August-October 1988, minimal pay will go up to 2,000 lei monthly. Roughly 2.5 million working people especially young people in the early years of their activity, will benefit by the respective rise.

The Executive Political Committee showed that the more marked rise in the remuneration of the working people with lower incomes bespoke the RCP's constant concern for the provision of ever better living conditions for all working people, in full accord with the principles of socialist ethics and equity.

In November and December rises will be effected for the working personnel with remunerations of up to 2,250 lei monthly. Over the interval, more than 1.8 million working people will have their pays augmented.

Throughout next year rises will be effected in the pays of the other categories of working personnel with tariff remunerations higher than 2,250 lei monthly.

Owing to the pay rises the working people will benefit from additional incomes worth 5.8 thousand million lei in 1988, 24.4 thousand million lei in 1989, and more than 29 thousand million lei in 1990.

The new steps towards increasing remuneration strongly reflect the vigorous and sound character of the national economy, as they are applied against the background of a complex world economic situation when in a number of countries the working people have their incomes cut down.

The Executive Political Committee expressed the conviction that the measures for higher payment would still more powerfully mobilize the forces and creative power of all working people with a view to exemplarily fulfilling the plan for this year and the whole five-year period, appropriately implementing the programmes for the organization and modernization of production processes, for higher technological and qualitative standards of products, lower manufacture expenses and consumption, steadily higher productivity and economic efficiency, providing for the material resources needed to raise the incomes of working people, the welfare of the whole people.

Next, the Executive Political Committee debated and approved the proposals regarding the schooling plan and the number of scholarships for the 1988-1989 academic year.

It was stressed that, when establishing the schooling plan, in view were the orientations of the thirteen congress and the national conference of the party, the decisions of the congress of science and education as well as the proposals of ministries, central institutions and executive committees of people's councils.

The Executive Political Committee assessed that the school enrollment figures for next year evinced the special concern the party and state show for the development and modernization of education, its organic integration into research and production, the moulding of thoroughly trained and highly skilled personnel for all fields of activity, in accordance with the current and future demands of socialist construction in Romania.

In the new academic year 94 percent of the ninth-grade students are estimated to be trained in industrial, agroindustrial, silvicultural and economic high schools. The ninth-grade evening courses will be attended by a growing number of students as to the 1987-1988 school year, especially by youths who worked in a production unit in the past years and who, according to the present rules, have to complete their studies for a ten-year compulsory education.

The proposals made provide for the enrollment of the graduates from ten-year education in an organized learning form—vocational and high schools.

The Executive Political Committee showed that the schooling plan, and the measures taken in this sphere create conditions for the twelve-year compulsory education to be generalized till 1990, which will help raise the general standards of education and culture of the homeland's youths.

In the 1988-1989, the number of students at day courses grew more than 1,470, more particularly in technical and economic schools.

The Executive Political Committee also approved the proposals for the number of scholarships to be granted to students in the 1988-1989 academic year, considering that they ensure good conditions for life, work and study to the young generation.

Niculescu Addresses Balkan Cooperatives Meeting

AU2805173388 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1720 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Athens, AGERPRES, 28/5/1988-Paul Niculescu, chairman of the Central Union of Consumer Cooperatives, who attends the debates conducted during the third meeting of the chairmen of cooperative organizations in Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Romania and Turkey, now under way in Athens, set forth the Romanian viewpoint on the development of the links of collaboration and friendship among Balkan countries, with emphasis on the importance of President Nicolae Ceausescu's proposal for the urgent calling in Bucharest of a Balkan summit for the transformation of the Balkans into a nuclear- and chemical-weapon-free zone, without foreign military bases and troops.

The participants in the meeting stated in support of the actions and initiatives intended to provide for the development of links of friendship and good neighbourliness among all Balkan countries, and the transformation of the Balkans into a zone of peace.

Opening of UN Disarmament Session Marked

AU3005203388 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1930 GMT 30 May 88

["Romania and the Problems of Disarmament"—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES, 30/05/1988—The proceedings of the third UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament, a political event which the international public opinion, that is ever more concerned over the continuation of the dangerous nuclear, chemical and conventional arms race and over the threat posed by the divertion of the gains of science and technology to destructive purposes, that are harmful to mankind, awaits with keen interest, opens in New York on Tuesday.

After 1978 and 1982, this is the third time the UN General Assembly devotes a special session to disarmament which, in the outlook of Romania and President Nicolae Ceausescu, is a fundamental problem of our days.

The major target of the current session is the elaboration of a programme of action to cover various aspects of disarmament in the nuclear and conventional areas, as well as measures to boost confidence.

As is known, the Executive Political Committee of the CC of the RCP agreed that, according to the mandate entrusted to them, the Romanian delegation should actively promote their country's stance and President Nicolae Ceausescu's outlook on and proposals for the cessation of the arms race, of the nuclear arms race in the first place, the achievement of a passage to disarmament, the prevention of outer space militarization, an end to nuclear-weapon tests, the liquidation of chemical arms, the substantial reduction of conventional weapons, of troops and military spending, the removal of the war threat and the ensurance of the nations' and people's foremost right to existence, to freedom, to independence, to peace.

The Romanian delegation are empowered to reiterate their country's will to further work for the strengthening of cooperation with all peoples, with the advanced forces everywhere, in the fight for the firm assertion of the peace, disarmament and collaboration policy, for the elimination of the use and threat of force from international relations, for the constructive settlement of the major issues facing mankind, for the building of a better and more just world, free of weapons and war, in which each nation may concentrate its creative efforts on free, self-reliant development on the road of economic and social progress.

'Military Balance' Through Disarmament Supported

AU2805155188 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1442 GMT 28 May 88

["A 'Military Balance' Through Disarmament and Not by Filling the 'Gaps' in Military Arsenals"—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest AGERPRES 28/5/1988—In its Saturday's issue, the leading Bucharest newspaper ROMANIA LIBERA runs an article to take stance against the ever more marked tendencies that have emerged of a number of NATO countries towards eluding the true meaning of the INF Treaty. The concern on the part of strategists to fill in the "gaps" in military stockpiles, the newspaper writes, has never been as apparent as it is now when a number of nuclear weapons are to be eliminated from certain arsenals.

As is known, by applying the Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles (the INF Treaty) the existing nuclear potential drops by five percent at the most. That is why, the significance of that accord resides in the creation of a precedent on the road to disarmament rather than in a palpable reduction of the destructive force of atom-based weapons.

Through a "turn of the notion", which is intended to be both subtle and disinterested, but which, in fact, is exactly the opposite, a number of Western strategists give priority to the latter aspect. Consequently, they sound the alarm and, more particularly, they make

recommendations and proposals for the quantitative and qualitative growth of the military stockpiles of NATO countries which, according to their statements, are intended to annihilate the effects of the "nuclear decoupling" between the USA and the respective states.

In consideration of the fact that the treaty signed last December in Washington prohibits the manufacture of aircraft—or submarine-based weapons, a number of Western strategists take action, under the sign of... legality, to develop existing types or create new types of airborne nuclear missiles and of weapons based on submarine military vessels. [sentence as received]

In consideration of what the treaty does not stipulate proposals are made for a rise in the number of missiles with a range below 500 kms, in a simultaneous attempt at avoiding the third "zero option".

In other cases, rather transparent "hints" are made, such as that whereby the Federal Republic of Germany is required to continue to accept the location of short-range missiles in its territory. And other opinions, too, converge in the same direction.

Undoubtedly, the Romanian newspaper points out, all the individuals who think of disarmament-related questions in a realistic manner wonder about the meaning of all these attempts.

Like weapons, ROMANIA LIBERA further writes, are considered to intensify rather than lessen international stability... However, the objective question arises: Could like answer, which is set on the outlook that by implementing the INF treaty the Western world would find itself in the open, be satisfactory?

All in all, the image of the balance of forces in Europe appears equilibrated. There is a balance, and that balance must be preserved, ROMANIA LIBERA writes and shows in conclusion: However, the solution that meets the interests of the peoples and of peace is not to look for equality upwards. On the contrary, a balance must be achieved through disarmament. In this respect, the application of the first accord on nuclear disarmament should not be followed by actions to "fill" the possible "gap" in nuclear arsenals, but by steps intended to prove that "in the eleventh hour" everyone understood that the only chance for the survival of the earth and of its inhabitants is disarmament. A chance that can be attained step by step.

CSSR Leaders Send Thanks for Greetings

Message to Ceausescu, Dascalescu

AU3105150088 Bucharest SCINTEIA in Romanian 28 May 88 p 5

[Text] To Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, RCP secretary general and president of the SR of Romania and to Comrade Constantin Dascalescu, prime minister of the government of the SR of Romania

Esteemed comrades,

On behalf of the CPCZ Central Committee, the CSSR Government, the whole of the Czechoslovak people, and on our own behalf, please accept our most sincere thanks for the congratulations that you extended to us on the CSSR national day—the 43d anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation from German fascism.

The Czechoslovak people will never forget the sacrifices made by the Romanian soldiers in liberating our homeland. We are convinced that the traditional relations of friendship between the CPCZ and the RCP and between the CSSR and the SR of Romania will continue to develop in the spirit of the treaty of friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance and in keeping with the results of the summit talks, for the benefit of the Czechoslovak people and in the interest of the cause of peace and progress.

In turn, we convey to you the same comradely greetings and we wish you, and through you all the Romanian people, much success in building the comprehensively developed socialist society in the fraternal SR of Romania.

Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee

Gustav Husak, CSSR president

Lubomir Strougal, CSSR premier

Strougal Message to Dascalescu

AU3105151688 Bucharest SCINTEIA in Romanian 29 May 88 p 5

[Text] Comrade Constantin Dascalescu, prime minister of the government of the SR of Romania received a message from Comrade Lubomir Strougal, in which the CSSR premier expresses thanks for the congratulations extended to him on his reelection to office as head of the CSSR Government. The message expresses the hope that all possible efforts will be made in the future, too, to develop Czechoslovak-Romanian relations, in the spirit of the summit decisions.

American Book on History of Transylvania Noted

AU0106092288 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 0811 GMT 1 Jun 88

["An American Historian About the National Idea With the Romanians"—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES, 1/6/1988—Two Romanian publishing houses have recently included on their lists of releases two new volumes by American researcher Keith Hitchins, professor at the University of Illinois, Urbana, a specialist reputed for the accuracy of his investigations of the modern history of the peoples of central and southeast Europe, particularly the history of

the Romanian people and of the national liberation movement of the Transylvanian Romanians who lived under the rule of the Austro-Hungarian empire.

The first book, put out by the Bucharest Scientific and Encylopaedic Publishing House, is Keith Hitchins' "L'idee de Nation Chez Les Roumains de Transylvanie (1691-1849)," which is Mihail Platareanu's French translation, directly from the English original, of the work "The Idea of Nation. The Romanians of Transylvania, 1691-1849", published by the same Romanian publishing house in 1985.

The second work came out at the Dacia Publishing House in Cluj-Napoca where the author had had several other books printed in Romanian since 1970, among which studies on the modern history of Transylvania, and culture and nationality in Transylvania. The new book is entitled "National Consciousness and Political Action With the Romanians in Transylvania. 1700-1868." It is the Romanian version of the collection of studies published by Keith Hitchins in internationally-circulated historical magazines and reproduced in the volume "Studies on Romanian Consciousness" put out by Nagard publishers in Rome in 1983.

It should be mentioned that on the publication of these two books the prodigious, American researcher's vast bibliography—inaugurated in 1969 with his remarkable doctoral thesis "The Romanian National Movement in Transylvania, 1790-1849"—numbered 15 volumes, 62 articles and papers, and 110 scientific reviews, all analysing the evolution of the national idea with the Romanians in all its complexity and scope, from a demographic, national, socio-cultural and political point of view, in its central and southeast European context. Whether they analyze the phases of the political status covered by the ancient Romanian province of Transylvania under foreign dominions in the 17th-19th centuries, the development of national consciousness with the Transylvanian Romanians, the role of the enlightenment and of its leading representatives, as well as of the ancestral church in the assertion of the national idea, the evolution of the national movement and the place of the leaders of the Romanian bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1848-1849, or the formation of the modern Romanian nation—all these aspects approached in close relation to the major European trends and ideas of the time—Keith Hitchins' new studies, very much like his entire work stand out by the relevance and objectivity of their conclusions concerning the historical processes investigated. These conclusions essentially coincide with those of the Romanian historians, which eloquently attests their convergent preoccupations and responsibility with respect to the imperative of observing historical truth.

Reports From LCY Conference Discussion Groups

Political System Group Meets

LD0106213788 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0828 GMT 31 May 88

[Excerpts] Belgrade, 31 May (TANJUG)—Unity should be built on socialist self-management, a common market, and the observance of market laws, Juraj Martinovic (Bosnia-Hercegovina) stressed at the start of today's discussion in the group for the political system. However, the debate so far has shown that the word unity does not have the same meaning for everybody. Therefore, it may happen, Martinovic thinks, that the standpoints to be adopted by the conference will be interpreted in a different way in different environments.

Market laws will, in addition, regulate relations in the Federation but they have no magic powers. It is thus unrealistic to expect them to resolve all our problems, Martinovic noted. He called for the formation of a chamber of associated labor in the SFRY Assembly to enable associated labor to regulate relations and interpret and safeguard its interests. [passage omitted]

In the view of Slobodan Unkovic (Serbia), no society can overcome a crisis unless it has young people in the forefront of the battle. At this conference young people comprise only 9 percent of all delegates. The entire membership must therefore take part in tackling this important task. The work on the constitutional changes should be completed by the fall to make way for the prompt implementation of the necessary reforms in the economic system. [passage omitted]

In view of the fact that there is no disunity in basic LC organizations, it appears that the leaderships are primarily responsible for the disintegration in the LC, Dragan Pavlovic (Visegrad) said. He called for a more clear-cut separation of the state and the party and for a compulsory return to their original base of officials once their mandates at federal level expire. I am convinced, he said in reference to the FEC's work, that the Government includes the best and most capable people, and now that they have come up with a specific program of emerging from the crisis we must allow them to carry it out.

Vilma Mancek (Slovenia) does not deem an extraordinary congress necessary, as its work would again comprise discussions of familiar topics. This would be a waste of time and money. Those who ask for an extraordinary congress, if they really think that is the problem, should have the courage to propose the dismissal of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, especially in view of the fact that the LCY Central Committee has powers to recall the Presidium.

Noting that the majority of responsibility for failure to implement the conclusions of the 13th LCY Congress rests with "us, who are present here," she asked the Central Committee to assume the task of ensuring the implementation of the conference standpoints.

[passage omitted]

In reference to relations within Serbia, Stevan Sogorov denied claims about Serbia's inequality in relation to other republics. He stressed that the working people and citizens in the republic enjoyed full equality.

Disagreeing with the views put forward by Radmila Andjelkovic and Bogdan Trifunovic, Sogorov warned that the unity and togetherness in Serbia could not be reduced to the issue of which functions the republic should perform.

The LC must act on time and correctly Slavko Radovic of Zvornik said, echoing the demand by his environment for cadre changes. Those who have failed to produce results must leave their leading position and make way for younger, capable people, full of enthusiasm who will build a better future for us.

The conference should also come up with clear stands on work stoppages to prevent them from assuming unprecedented proportions.

The work should start as early as tomorrow on eliminating enormous social differences. We must not allow people to go hungry or be left to care for themselves. [passage omitted] [Transmission interrupted; TANJUG parts four through six not received]

A great deal is expected from the LCY Conference, Milomir Minic (Serbian LC Central Committee) said, deeming it an opportunity for regaining revolutionary courage in the LC, for making a definite break with the practice of not implementing the declared policy, and for speeding up the process of decisionmaking in Yugoslavia. For this we need untiy among the leaderships.

Minic dwelled in greater detail on Kosovo and relations within the republic. He warned that the LCY policy on Kosovo is "falling to pieces." The clarity of the conference standpoints will help to fulfill many of the tasks on Kosovo that have not yet been tackled.

We have failed to secure safety for people, hostile activity has not stopped, there has been no improvement in intranational relations, national divisions have taken place in Kosovo, one group of people is fighting for its rights by meetings, petitions, journeys to Belgrade. Many are emigrating, and many are expecting the conference to provde an answer to the question: to stay or to go. [passage omitted] [Transmission interrupted, no more TANJUG takes received after 1059 GMT]

Socioeconomic Relations Group Confers

LD3105234388 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0753 GMT 31 May 88

[Excerpts] Belgrade, 31 May (TANJUG)—The 3d day of proceedings in the group for socioeconomic relations of the LCY Conference began with demands to accelerate differentiation in the LC leadership. Boro Avramovic from Borovo said that the party requires a "general overhaul," and the process must begin with the LCY Central Committee Presidium.

We need to advocate, Avramovic added, not massive but an efficient LCY, and differentiation must be based on the implementation of the tasks one has assumed. In demanding a united LC, Avramovic joined those who have been demanding a single statute of the party organization.

It is common knowledge, Rade Milicevic from Trstenik said, who took part in the adoption of the decisions important for the development of our society and who is responsible for the fact that they have not been carried out, who are the standard-bearers of autonomous ideas and of isolationism. There is little likelihood that the very people who brought us into this crisis will also pull us out of it.

The LCY Central Committee, Milicevic added, should carry out a differentiation within its ranks by the end of September. Only morally pure and united leaderships can restore the confidence of the membership. Without that, we cannot expect differentiation to be carried out among rank and file members as well. [passage omitted]

Stevo Grubjesic (LCY Central Committee) noted the unrealistic nature of the demands to the effect that unless changes are made in our economic and political system by the end of the year a special congress be held. He assessed such demands as unrealistic. [passage omitted]

Following Branko Asanovic, who spoke on the need for affirmation of responsibility and differentiation in the leaderships, Zvonimir Hrabar asked if by any chance the LC has already become the vanguard of the administrative segment of those employed, because workers are increasingly leaving it.

Our legislation provides a good basis for the rights and status of the working class, but in actual fact we have an entirely different situation. This is because a great portion of the working class is in an exceptionally difficult situation, Hrabar continued. Proceeding from that, the workers are demanding reaffirmation of self-management because in this area, where we used to be pioneers, very little of that has been left. The workers' opinion is that we have forgotten the class elements and that we have subordinated everything to nationalism. They have said more than once that they are looking for a modern economy, which means they are demanding compliance with market laws. [transmission interrupted; TANJUG parts three and four not received] [passage omitted] [Transmission interrupted; TANJUG parts six and seven not received] [passage omitted]

The working people are wondering what has happened with the stances we adopted at the 13th congress and the 9th session of the LCY Central Committee, said Daut Caja from Kosovo. We are particularly worried by the fact that the stands on Kosovo are not being implemented, Caja added.

Dragutin Kaurin from Prijedor spoke of the latest federal government measures and about "curtailment" of expenditure, that is, reduced personal income, which has also hit the people with the lowest income. He suggested that either the idea of personal income being returned be abandoned or that it should be "extended" until September. He too joined the demands that the intervention measures should not be passed this year but that they should be fixed at the time the annual development plans are adopted to enable work organizations to know exactly in which conditions they will be operating.

The discussion speech by Taib Bekto, a delegate of the LC organization in the organs of the federation, focused on the international aspects of our crisis. The reputation, the role, and international position of Yugoslavia are still at a high level, he said. This is testified to by our successful bilateral contacts with the superpowers, Japan, and with the nonaligned countries. However, Bekto said, we must say that if our country continues to lag behind on the economic and technological plane and if the crisis gets worse, our international situation will deteriorate, slowing down the pace of our foreign policy.

Bekto Graphically provided an example of the kind of impact our internal crisis has in the international arena by reference to the banal cases when some of our diplomatic missions were unable to meet their financial commitments for the hire of premises and other expenditure. This reputation, but for entirely different reasons, is also affected by lack of organization in our approach to the world, because it often happens that within very brief periods of time several delegations visit the same countries.

The internal crisis has a particularly negative impact on our workers temporarily working abroad and also on our emigrants. True, according to Bekto, a majority go on nurturing a patriotic attitude toward their country, but a lack of trust in our stability arises, their return is delayed, and the amount of their savings in our banks is reduced, while the number of those applying for naturalization abroad is rising. This is testified by the fact that last year alone, 647 citizens of our country took French citizenship.

Time is working against us and for our enemies, Dusan Catovic (Belgrade) said. He said that in the future even the top party leaderships will not be able to take the trust of the membership for granted merely on the basis of

demagogic fairy tales and false promises. Because of this kind of their activity, trust in the LC was lost year after year, trust which the older generations of Yugoslav leaders had painstakingly gained. [passage omitted] Securing foreign currency is also a major problem, Ali Sabani (LCY Central Committee) said, noting that the party commitment to the faster development of the Socialist Autonomous Province of Kosovo is not fully implemented. Without economic equality there is no national equality, he said. He proposed that party documents on the development of Kosovo cannot remain "a dead letter."

Sabani spoke against the demands for a special congress to be convened. He said that this is suggested by some members of the top party leaderships as if they themselves are not responsible for the present situation and as if hard work for the implementation of the stands of this conference does not apply to them. There have been many meetings for the sake of meeting, but what we require is action, Sabani said in conclusion. [passage omitted]

The elements of confederation can be eliminated only through greater unity, Rajko Nenadovic said. Zeljka Papac (Croatia LC Central Committee) advocated a different approach to the problems of the young generation in the proposed final document.

Both Dragisa Banic from Krusevac and several other delegates demanded that those who had brought us into this situation should be clearly and separately identified. The conference, he believes, should oblige the LCY Central Committee to set in motion the process of determining the responsibility of the people holding responsible offices.

Dragoljub Stanojevic from Vranje spoke about the market, stressing that it should not be left to its own devices but be based on the plan. Jusuf Bijesovic, a delegate of the LC in the Yugoslav People's Army, denounced the attacks on the allocation of resources for the requirement of Yugoslav national defense, stressing that the Army keeps a watchful eye on the way every dinar is spent.

Dobrila Kocanski from Macedonia spoke for a greater degree of unity within the LC ranks, and so did Vera Studen from Beocin who, in addition, also noted the unfavorable position of the economy.

Gligor Popovski from Skopje, recalling the difficult economic situation in Macedonia, opposed the changes in the nature of the fund for the underdeveloped areas and of the present way of pooling labor and resources. The state, he believes, should devise a mechanism to mitigate the consequences of the economic measures that are applied to everyone but that produce uneven consequences in view of the different level of development of the individual parts of the country. [passage omitted]

Slavko Marinkovic from Titovo Uzice was very specific: A special congress has to be convened by the end of the year if it is established after the conference that the stands that it adopted and differentiation at all levels are not implemented.

After speaking of the administration maintained by the economy, he stressed that the penal policy for economic crime should be tighten up to put an end to the flow of the very considerable social resources into private pockets—not infrequently the pockets of the people in the most senior offices in the state and economic organs.

Marinkovic was also quite specific in his demand that the property of individuals not acquired through honest work should be confiscated. I know that some people think this is a marginal problem, he added, but I am confident that precisely this is the breeding ground of the greatest dissatisfaction by "ordinary" people. Having asked, in conclusion, who is responsible for the nonimplementation of the conclusions of the 13th LCY Congress, he said that it is often not clear to the working class whether or not the LC is on its side or on the side of petty bourgeoisie. [passage omitted]

Drasko Milicevic, a delegate of the Serbia LC Central Committee believes that the materials prepared for the conference are not in keeping with the depth of the crisis, which is also true of the introductory report which could have been read 15 years ago.

He took umbrage at the fact that the materials were prepared by a working group instead of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, which he interpreted as lack of agreement within the leadership. I do not believe in a leadership that asks the membership to say how we should get out of the crisis and how we should work, but in a leadership that has the courage to propose a way out of the crisis and ask the membership for support, Milicevic said.

The 33-page conference stands, in his view, have no significance whatsoever, because two or three pages are sufficient to provide a clear strategy to overcome the difficulties.

Milicevic advocates a special LCY congress, because he is convinced that a change in leadership is necessary because the people who dragged the country into the crisis cannot extricate it. In his opinion the aura of tragedy should be removed from the idea of changing the people, and others should be given a chance. It is true that many "have been pushed" into top office, and that they are victims of the "keys," but the country as a whole should not be the victim, Milicevic said.

The Croatia LC Central Committee believes that the only answer to the crisis is development, stressed Franciska Jurak, who spelled it out that the LC must opt for the socialism of the 21st century in which the basis of

development will be intellect and not human sweat. In her view the conference should state clearly that investments in education are a most valuable outlay.

Development requires changes in the LC, and those who cannot do it should cede their place to those who are capable of doing it. A special congress is not required for that, she believes, because the preparations could drag on for a long time against the background of expectations that someone else will resolve the problems, whereas now every moment is precious.

The responsibility of the members of the LCY Central Committee and of its Presidium could, in her view, be assessed by the central committees and provincial committees of the republics and provinces respectively, proceeding from the contributions they have made to the implementation of the stands of the 13th LCY Congress.

Development Group Deliberates

LD3105225988 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0848 GMT 31 May 88

[Excerpts] Belgrade, 31 May (TANJUG)—Today's continued debate in the group for the development of the LC at the LCY conference started with a reply from Franc Setinc to some speeches about democratic centralism. Noting that his understanding of this has not essentially been contradicted by anyone, Setinc said democratic centralism is a means, not of imposing discipline, but of establishing paths for implementing party policy. In this respect, it is not all the same whether or not these are democratic or are formulated from positions of power.

Such an understanding, Setinc said, is not factionalism. Rather it could be said that it is factionalism if someone calls on the unquestioning support of the majority before the majority has had any chance of making its views heard. Saying that the issue of democratic centralism is of crucial importance for the LC, Setinc reserved the right to remain in the minority in showing that the socialist alliance is undervalued, which means, he said, that the widest segments of the working people and citizens are also undervalued.

He also agreed to be in a minority on the issue of an understanding of the role of the press, because he said that this should not be seen as and reduced to "crisisology" [krizeologija]. Nevertheless, I will struggle for the views of the majority, but in a truly democratic, and not a bureaucratic, centralism, Setinc concluded.

I am a member of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, Vasil Tupurkovski said, and I really think that its responsibility for the current situation is great, even that it bears primary responsibility. Above all for not halting the federalization of the LC, because in the Presidium itself there is a hidden awareness of the safeguarding of individual interests.

Neither should our responsibility for the growth of nationalism be underestimated, Tupurkovski said. Our responsibility in this respect is enormous, particularly with regard to the situation in Kosovo. We bear responsibility also as far as moral "purity" and cover-ups are concerned, he said, adding that for this reason every member of the LCY Central Committee Presidium should reexamine scrupulously his position with regard to the revolutionary criteria of LC membership.

We also bear responsibility for remaining silent on violations of the party program, Tupurkovski said, noting that he himself cannot remain immune in this respect. All this, he stated, as well as the proceedings at the conference so far, do not justify a positive verification of his work in the Presidium.

It is similar with the party leaderships in the republics and provinces, without exception, Tupurkovski continued. He expressed the opinion that their euphoric positive assessments do not reflect the real situation. Assessing that political processes must be oriented toward the working class and not toward the building of power relations in the leaderships, Tupurkovski said that the climate in the LC calls for a change of direction in Yugoslav and socialist positions. It is essential to make more dynamic and more radical the struggle for halting the crisis. After this conference, the LC should no longer be concerned with changing itself but must truly become a factor for Yugoslav reintegration. Because it is impermissible that it should become the party of recession, and the implementation of the decisions of the conference will be a special kind of test for the leadership, Tupurkovski stressed.

No political force that calls itself a vanguard, Darja Colaric (LCY Central Committee) said, can be a vanguard if it does not have a clearly formulated nationality program, acceptable to all. Yugoslavia is possible only with a realistic respect for all national differences, she stressed, warning of the danger of national unitarism as a form of nationalism, which is by no means harmless. The future of self-managing socialism, in her opinion, is linked to the future of the nations and the nationalities, which must have scope for articulating their own interests. [passage omitted]

The Communists of Ilidza believe that the holding of republican party conferences at different times and with different themes is yet more proof of the disunity in our party. This should be overcome primarily by strengthening responsibility and through cadre renewal, Sulejman Hadzovic said. Another of the opinions from this environment is that the way to overcome the separation of the grassroots from the leaderships is to abolish basic LC organizations in work communities outside associated labor—in the sociopolitical organizations and communities and their organs—and link them to the local communities and basic organizations of associated labor from which they come. This would ensure direct communication with the membership, the leaders would be

faced on the spot with assessments of their work and of the institutions in which they work. [passage omitted] [transmission interrupted; TANJUG parts five and six]

Nebojsa Radmanovic (Banja Luka) sees the main preconditions for a way out of the crisis as being the strengthening of unity, general democratization, particularly of cadre policy, and the moral "purity" of the LC. Differing understandings of democratic centralism cannot be a reason for not implementing established policy. Differentiation, he said, must start with the leaderships, while not losing sight of the fact that the LCY Central Committee is not alone in being to blame.

Calling for radical cadre renewal, Radmanovic warned that the moral character of the LC member is seriously threatened by the increasingly widespread primitivism in society. This is a problem of civilization that threatens to lead us into the 21st century, but in essence is a step backward into the 19th century. Radmanovic spoke critically of the part of the report by Bosko Krunic, president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, which states that social activities are burdening the economy. All the reductions so far in this respect have not helped the economy and have caused great damage to social activities, Radmanovic stressed.

The discussions so far, in the opinion of Avgust Majeric (Maribor), show that we have drawn no closer to one another. I sensed a certain anger from Serbian delegates who put matters very sharply, wishing to embark on changes. Once we used to applaud the leaders, and now there are calls for them to step down because the crisis does not permit applause.

Majeric said that the working class cannot exist on monolithic unity and democratic centralism but is instead seeking better living conditions, without restraints from bureaucracy and without the suspicion that someone is spending the results of its work. Some consider that federalization is mainly to blame, Majeric continued, but I am afraid that apparent unity will not bring greater efficiency.

He alluded to yesterday's speech by Ratomir Vico in which he opposed the atmosphere in which it was as though there were an advertisment to see who wanted to remain in Yugoslavia and who did not. Majeric said that his impression is that there are calls for another kind of advertisement hiding behind this, for a federation, or a unitary state. In Slovenia we are sensitive to such things, because as a nation we are in a minority. There are also criticisms to the effect that Communists in Slovenia are flirting with counterrevolution, and we are also blamed with pronounced tendencies toward federalization. Majeric said that Slovenia comprises 8 percent of Yugoslavia's population but contributes 20 percent of the country's social product. Was it the Slovene delegation in the SFRY Assembly that blocked the orientation of the 13th LCY Congress for directing the economy toward being market-oriented? For this reason, we must move from discussions in principle to a quite specific answer as to who is holding up change. We should confront each other face to face on this, Majeric said. He ended by saying that today Marx, listening to Yugoslav Communists, would doubtless only be able to say: "I am not a Marxist."

Speaking about the situation in the press, Branka Novakovic (Montenegrin LC Central Committee) noted that social divisions inevitably contribute to disunity in the sphere of information in Yugoslavia. She said that newspapers still stand firmly behind their republican and provincial leaderships, stubbornly defending factional interests. The elimination of this, in Branka Novakovic's opinion, would contribute to greater unity.

Calling for toleration toward those of differing opinions, Vinko Zgajner (Celje) noted that until yesterday young people were criticized for being apolitical, and now, when they are attempting to express their views, they receive lectures. As far as the majority-minority relationship is concerned, Zgajner said that we should not allow the conservative majority to outvote the less conservative, progressive minority. What does democratic centralism mean to people who are not in the LC, he asked, adding that they should make their views known through the SAWP. An extraordinary LC congress, in Zgajner's opinion, is not necessary, because enough has been said already.

Sasa Pesic from Dimitrovgrad spoke about the problems of young people, and Silva Jereb (LCY Statutory Commission) on democratic centralism. In her words, it is vital to critically assess the functioning of this principle and find out how the LC acted from a position of power and how when it stepped down from the position of power. [sentence as received]

Can one develop a strategy of development, having eight economies that need Yugoslavia only as a guarantor for foreign credits? asked Zeljko Draganic from Cetinje. Can the LC realize a vanguard role, Draganic added, with eight such organizations and the sessions of the LCY Central Committee that resemble an out of tune band?

For how long, he continued, will the Serbs and Montenegrins cry for freedom and young people wait for a job while pensioners are working? Many are now even giving up their veterans' allowance, so long as they don't have to retire, forgetting that they had once fought for it passionately. [passage omitted]

Karel Vukovic from Trbovlje believes that the conference stands must devote much greater attention to the work of Communists in the basic LC organizations and local communities. Only fresh cadres who have the know-how, who show willingness, and who are not burdened with the past can introduce fresh meaning into LCY activity and changes to society. He agreed with the views to the effect that those who have led us into the crisis cannot lead us out of it. This is how we work, but

let's recall the events when some didn't want Veselin Djuranovic to be a member of the SFRY Presidency because he had been FEC president at the time when Yugoslavia incurred the largest debt.

Ratomir Vico reacted to this, saying that from the fact that the LCY leadership is being criticized here the conclusion cannot be drawn that this does not refer to the top people in the LC's of republican organizations. It is true that one Slovene leader refused to be in the Presidency together with Djuranovic, but this comrade was at the head of the republican LC organization for a long time and had the same, if not more, responsibility as Djuranovic, Vico said. (Neither of these two speakers specified which person they referred to, but it is well-known that this is France Popit.)

Ideological unity and unity in action cannot be attained by appeals for party discipline, but by the same views on the interests of the working class and the equality of all nations and nationalities, Kucusa Jasari (LCY Central Committee) said. [passage omitted]

A real offensive of antisocialist and anti-self-managing activity is felt in society, whose common denominator is nationalism. The aggressive activity of nationalists is felt particularly at the time of discussions on constitutional changes, and its aim is to impose solutions that are contrary to LCY policy.

In Kosovo Albanian nationalist and separatists now try to infiltrate themselves into the sphere of information in the role of defenders of the Albanian nationality. Their activity, apart from methods of pressure, is directed at further indoctrination and attempts to take advantage of every suitable moment or event in our society for sounding their sirens in various ways. This begins with petitions to the demands for a Kosovo republic, which they are also doing at this time of constitutional changes. Serbian and Montenegrin nationalists are involved in the same attempts, taking advantage of the consitutional changes to submit their demands for the abolition of provinces.

Kacusa Jasari dwelled, in particular, on the thesis to the effect that there is division on an intranational basis among cadres in Kosovo, even in organs. [sentence as received] She proposed that the stands referring to Kosovo should state in addition that this is only a tendency, and not that this division exists.

Ljubisav Marincevic from Kragujevac said that the activity of basic LC organizations livened up after the eighth session of the Serbian LC Central Committee. Communists from the Red Flag car factory also believe that in the future the LCY Central Committee president should be elected, because the Presidium does not justify the trust in the critical situation.

Creative and innovative environments require not an extraordinary congress but work conditions that would reaffirm this work, Dusan Vodeb from Ravna ironworks said.

Stane Kranjc, also from Slovenia, warned that the crisis is also an opportunity from demagogy and manipulations. Do not let us allow the crisis to be used for wrong divisions and retrograde processes that would jeopardize the LC's democratic nature in society. [passage omitted]

A minority exists, whether we like it or not. It changes, moving from topic to topic, and each one of us is represented in it at times, said Boris Muzevic, member of the LCY Central Committee. These are not factions, in my opinion. It is, in fact, the most normal condition in life, however we describe it in the work of the LC. As far as the question of who is terrorizing whom is concerned, Muzevic believes that there is more than one possiblity. A possible example is that the minority that leads the majority and that has the majority's consent for this is terrorizing this majority a great deal. He also mentioned that the majority should respect the minority if it cares for itself and its stands.

Hrvoje Istuk proposed that parallel to the work on changes in the economic and political system a program should be prepared for adapting the LC's work to these new conditions. [passage omitted]

In disucssions on the majority and the minority in the LCY, we should bear in mind that earlier the leading minority led the party and society well, and that its followers had unlimited confidence in it. The situation has changed fundamentally. We are dealing with a crisis of confidence in which the majority, which up to now has been passive, feels manipulated, Nenad Kecmanovic from Sarajevo said. He also spoke about the position of a particular kind of minority—individuals who found themselves in opposition to various abuses and frauds, who had been cruelly silenced, and whom time had proved to be right.

The LC owes protection to such people, who have all experienced tragic fates. For this reason, political rehabilitation should be introduced, because without it there can be no democracy, Kecmanovic said.

The last speaker in this group was Ankica Crvencanin, a textile worker from Belgrade. It is lamentable that the party becomes interested in the problems of workers only when they stop working, when they start striking, she said. She added that she respects all veterans but that she does not agree with the proposal that we should have only one person to lead us, or that we should all think the same.

Since the start of the conference, 124 delegates have spoken, while 12 joined in the debate in the group for the development of the LC.

Federal Chamber's Assessment of FEC Reported

AU2705101888 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 16 May 88 pp 5, 6

[Report on the Federal Chamber's session of 14 May discussing the report on the FEC's performance in the last 2 years: "Criticism Underlined With Support"]

[Excerpts] Lazo Tesla: "Unaccomplished Task" [subhead]

In its report, the FEC claims that the measures introduced so far could not reduce inflation and that inflation cannot be curbed without radical changes and reforms in the economic as well as political system. However, when it was proposing all its measures during the last 2 years, the FEC did not speak and reason in this way, but was, in fact, trying to convince us of the opposite, that its measure would achieve the desired aims and results. Now, the FEC is telling a different story. But, even before we said in the SFRY Assembly that those measures will not check inflation because one cannot use prohibitions and restrictions to achieve desired aims without stimulating the economy, even if it is only a small part of the economy, and without stimulating economic production. There is no success without motivating workers, especially when their personal incomes are extremely low.

Having realized that its measures were not successful, the FEC changed its explanation and said that the measures did not check inflation, but that had it not been for them, inflation would have reached the 220 percent mark by January 1988. Well comrade delegates, we cannot allow this kind of behavior. This is not the way a government or an assembly explains things, this is not the way to seriously overcome the crisis. I do not know what would happen to a communal executive council if it had come up with such an explanation. This is voluntarism, sheer guesswork, and not an exact statement.

I think that all open questions should be tackled jointly, and as a whole. But at the same time, this does not provide justification for the FEC beginning only this year to seriously discuss, make concrete, and attempt to put into operation the political tenets of the 13th LCY Congress and the Long-Term Economic Stabilization Program. Concrete proposals are only now emerging. I said "emerging" because we still do not know anything except what we have heard in the report.

The FEC, the SFRY Assembly, and the republican and provincial assemblies exhausted themselves in their attempt to reach an accord on the program of measures, but we all know the result.

Considering the socioeconomic crisis, the FEC did not accomplish its job in the way it should have according to its constitutional powers and constitutional responsibilities.

In connection with the question of holding a vote of confidence in the FEC, I would like to stress that this should be seen in the context of the general democratization of society, as an integral part of the political system of self-management rather than as a question raised by one republic or province. The process of stabilizing the economy is not showing any improvement. The economic crisis is becoming more and more acute, the working people and citizens, regardless of which republic or province they come from, are increasingly losing confidence in the measures undertaken as well as in the organs and institutions that have proposed and undertaken these measures.

Therefore, giving or not giving a vote of confidence should be seen in this context. If the vote of confidence is to be held, this will strengthen the belief in the FEC and its work, and that the proposed measures will achieve the desired aim and reduce inflation. All of us who are proposing that a vote of confidence be held are aware that this is not the right moment for this because we have to finalize the agreement with the IMF and adjust the program of economic policies to the 1-year stand-by arrangement. We are also aware that if we do not strengthen our confidence in the FEC, we will jeopardize not only what has been previously proposed, but also the realization of the new IMF program that should soon be finalized.

But if the delegates do not express their confidence, this will indeed mean postponing and extending things, or perhaps a loss of pace in realizing the IMF program. At the same time this will be either the condemnation or an expression of mistrust in a particular method of finding a way out of the crisis. This is no longer the question of the FEC members' names, but a general rejection of the way the program of measures is being implemented and the way the country's most vital economic and political questions are being resolved.

Therefore, this is the matter that concerns the SFRY, and not one republic or province.

Therefore, one should not look at who is proposing that a vote of confidence be held, from which republics or provinces these calls come, but one should assess the situation and relations in the Yugoslav community as a whole, and on the basis of that make one's own assessments and judgments.

I am therefore surprised that in his speech today, the FEC president spoke about a six-to-two division and said that this had adversely affected the Yugoslav social and political situation and that it had become a cause for speculation. Why should the things be seen in this way, especially by the FEC? Should we not talk about associated labor and self-management as a whole. The economic situation is bad and serious everywhere, in the SR of Slovenia, in the SR of Croatia, in the SR of Macedonia, everywhere.

Why does the speech, in that context, state that we must get to the heart of the matter and make clear what kind of Yugoslavia we want: the AVNOJ [Antifascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia] or other type of Yugoslavia; what kind of socialism we want: a self-managing or some other type of socialism? Linking these question to the report or, to put it mildly, mentioning these questions in connection with the report on voting or expressing vote of confidence in the FEC is inappropriate, and I reject them. [passage omitted on delegates Momcilo Bukulic, Borislav Krajina, and Ratko Vukcevic endorsing FEC's report]

Zlatko Grabar: "Abused Trust" [subhead]

It is unfortunate that today we can say with certainty that despite having a generally accepted program on the one hand, and a free hand on the other, the FEC and its organs have almost completely failed to fulfill their program promise.

How did the FEC use our and the general public's trust? It used it in the best way it knew, by peppering the assembly, economy, and country with a series of packages of measures and laws adopted by urgent and summary procedures that often needed to be changed, again in an urgent and summary procedure. Let us today draw a line and analyze what the FEC has achieved with this kind of concept.

The tenets of the Long-Term Economic Stabilization Program have not been put into operation. The economic crisis is intensifying. Inflation is increasing, and social differences are become more notable. The greatest responsibility for this is borne by the FEC, because, "proposing to the SFRY Assembly how to formulate domestic and foreign policies" was in the FEC's hands, according to Article 347 of the SFRY Constitution. And we all know what is behind this.

It is therefore extremely surprising to hear today that we are all responsible for the present situation. I personally do not feel responsible and guilty because I did not propose the blueprint for overcoming the crisis. I was not late with measures, and I did not propose measures that did not produce results. But, I feel guilty for having up to now fully supported all the FEC's measures and summary laws for which, thanks to this same FEC, I did not have time to consult others, because they were just put in front of me, which is to say that even if I had had any objections, they would not have been accepted. Perhaps some other delegates are also guilty, as some of them have already said here, although I personally doubt their guilt, but I am not guilty. It is obvious that the time in front of us will be even more difficult, but we must not let it be created by somebody who we were so bitter about in our reports. It is absurd to expect that almost the same program—which we endorsed at the beginning of our term of office, but now criticize for its bad concept and almost nonexistent results, a program that is this time being dictated by an IMF memorandum—will now be realized by the same incumbents. There is no time for mistakes anymore.

And finally, I cannot but say that it is sad that those who had, whether we admit it or not, direct or indirect influence on the global trends in our society and on the political and economic life, those to whom the FEC used to turn and consult in the past period instead of this Assembly, are not among us for the umpteenth time. They should all, at least in here, listen to the voice of the working people and citizens today and in the future. Thank you. [passage omitted on delegate Zdravko Maric supporting the FEC]

Joze Marolt: "We Are Already in an Abyss" [subhead]

The intervention measures introduced in July 1986 opened the road to increasing administrative regulations, removing the accountability of economic entities, and narrowing economic independence. In brief, they opened the road to the negation of real economic categories and market laws, in other words, to the deepening of the gap between the stated, well-founded, and outlined policy and its practical application.

At that time, the FEC insisted on these measures, and even the FEC president, defending these measures in the middle of the night, stressed in particular that Yugoslavia was on the verge of an abyss and that the proposed package of measures could completely turn the negative trends around. He was referring to the Law on Personal Incomes. Even at this time, the FEC is convinced that it will achieve the desired aim with administrative measures. Then we had an escalation of personal incomes, including Slovenia, escalation of all forms of spending, and a fall in the reproductive ability of the economy.

Even then the FEC president threatened that unless we adopt all the measures contained in the package he would raise the question of confidence in the FEC. We witnessed an illusion about the power of administrative decisions applied professionally but with poor measures. This is only one example in the last 2 years, but there were also other similar examples that did not produce results.

Now we are no longer on the verge of an abyss, we are in the abyss. Who is responsible for that? I am convinced that the FEC is not responsible alone for all this, but its responsibility for proposing these measures and for the actual carrying out of the present economic policy is undoubtedly great, and we are now discussing this responsibility here in the assembly when we have the report on the 2 year results.

Viktorija Potocnik: "Unacceptable Division" [subhead]

I have carefully read the report and listened to the introductory speech on the FEC's results. I must admit that the report, the introductory speech, and the assessment of our own position in this assembly only confirm the doubts expressed 2 years ago on the FEC's ability to lead this country out of its economic crisis. I do not want to polemicize with numerous and, in my opinion, unacceptable assessments and insinuations contained in the report and expressed in today's introductory speech on the FEC's work, because I only judge success and results on the basis of how successfully the basic postulates of the economic system conducted by the FEC are functioning.

I cannot accept Comrade Mikulic's division of six against two. We are talking about a delegates' legitimate right and duty. We are talking about one's constitutional duty to raise the question of one's own responsibility and the responsibility of other organs in charge of the development of this system and, above all, of overcoming the crisis.

Is this kind of insinuation not merely a running away and a failure to admit the lack of one's own self-criticism? Is this not perhaps a push toward a situation of "let us quarrel among ourselves, and I will rule." [passage omitted on delegate Branislav Milovanovic speaking about problems in agriculture]

Husein Hodzic: "Mikulic Did Not Say Everything" [subhead]

I expected the speech of the FEC's president to be directed more toward views and demands that come from this assembly, and only then to polemicize with other critics. It is obvious that he was provoked by the Slovene and Croatian Assemblies' call for a vote of confidence, and by numerous articles in the press and commentaries on television that cannot be said to be well meaning. Therefore in some parts of his speech he went well beyond what was expected. I must say that on this occasion too, the FEC president did not want to be fully open. Today, Comrade Mikulic again did not say which institutions, organs, and individuals obstructed the realization of the FEC's program despite the fact that he had promised to do so on several occasions.

From his speech on cooperation with the SFRY Assembly, the state Presidency, and the LCY Central Committee Presidium, one cannot notice any problems. Which are then other forces in the country that are stronger than the above-mentioned bodies? Are they the republican assemblies, republican or provincial central committees, or are they republican or provincial presidencies?

The president of the FEC did not say everything about how and under whose pressure the FEC was giving in and what were the consequences of this. Is the FEC's policy of giving in to demands under pressure helping developing regions, and is the fact that Slovenia has a national income of $5,000 per capita while Kosovo has a 10 times smaller per capita figure a result of this? How is it possible that in a system such as ours, the SR of Slovenia has a national income close to that of some Western European countries, and it still attacks the system and the policies proposed by the FEC? Perhaps the comrades from Slovenia are right because I do not have sufficient arguments to judge this, nor the FEC's explanation as to why this is the case. I expected the president of the FEC to speak about these and similar issues today, but he refrained from this for reasons best known to himself.

Although it happened for the first time, I think that the initiative of the Slovene and Croatian delegates is a serious event in assembly life. As regards their proposal, I think that we do not have to strictly divide ourselves in a ratio of six to two. It is an assembly question as to whether, in this situation, Yugoslavia can have a better government, and who could guarantee this. If the Slovene and Croatian Assemblies could provide a guarantee, then I would immediately support their proposal irrespective of the fact that the next FEC could consist of 15 Slovenes, but sufficiently clever and capable to make moves that would lead to progress.

But, calling for the FEC's resignation without offering something in return, I regard as a move not worthy of consideration at the present time. We all know that the key to our crisis is not in the FEC, but in the party. Until the LC organizes itself and is ready to lead us, as it had done in the past, there will be no way out of the crisis, even if we change the FEC every 3 months. The excessive concentration of power in the hands of those who, it appears, do not know how to pull us out of this crisis, the lack of courage, and in some cases, tiredness after all those years of work, are a major constraint on all good intentions and wishes. Why did the presidencies and presidiums not ask themselves about their own responsibility in creating and carrying out this country's policy whose direct executor is the FEC and whom we are ready to attack, because such a climate has been created toward both Milka Planinc's and the present FEC.

This is why I think that the FEC's resignation cannot at present bring any improvements expected by those who made the proposal, and that a change in the composition of the FEC under unchanged relations between political and economic factors in the country and without the removal of sclerotic institutions and individuals will bring no progress to Yugoslav society.

This is why it would be more realistic that after it adopts the report, this Chamber asks the FEC president to prepare a serious proposal for the reconstruction of the government for one of our future sessions. [passage omitted on remarks made by delegates Zarija Martinovic, Ivan Veselinovic, Joze Susmelj, and Zdravko Zabukovec]

Milos Milosavljavic: "Political Demagoguery" [subhead]

Listening to today's discussion I felt on two occasions as if I was listening to a public prosecutor, and I asked myself: What prison sentence will be passed on the FEC members?

Raising the question of confidence is a democratic institute. But a democratic institute demands a democratic dialogue, a dialogue without manipulations, insinuations, and distortion of facts.

I asked for the floor mainly because of the speeches made by Comrades Tesla and Grabar, and some remarks made by other speakers. If the FEC were responsible for everything Comrade Tesla said in his speech, then not only should confidence in it be withdrawn, but the FEC should be, in my opinion, on the basis of charges made, immediately brought in front of a revolutionary court and sentenced.

The aid of working people from other socialist republics and provinces is solicited under the pretext that this FEC is responsible for all the difficulties of the working people and of those who do a poor job. I felt uneasy. Although according to the people who took part in the discussion and whom I mentioned above, I am also one of the culprits, I asked myself: How would the FEC members feel when they go out after this discussion? After all, we have already encountered the claim that we have created some kind of counterrevolutionary economic policy.

What we also have here is pandering to the workers class in other republics and provinces. How would one otherwise understand the mentioning of the UNIS and the Radoje Dikic work organizations? As if the delegates from those republics were not interested in the UNIS and Radoje Dikic. But, it is obvious that in the kind of political struggle waged here various means are being used. Therefore I understand this only as a political struggle.

Dangerous Divisions [subhead]

Our reality is somehow different. Today's discussion is a parliamentary discussion. The difference lies in the fact this FEC is not backed by any democratic, republican, Christian democratic, or socialist-democratic party. We do not have such parties behind us. In Italy, which some people publicly mention as a model, there is a continuity in politics, despite the fact that governments are coming and going. But we are divided on this, regardless of whether this division is in the ratio of six to two or some other ratio. And we are not a single nation country like Italy.

Our divisions, according to republics and provinces, or even worse, according to nationalities, are very dangerous. We know that from our history. We paid a very high price for that. Speaking about putting the clock back, as Delegate Zabukovec said before me, I do not fear putting the clock forward either.

We are not only sitting divided up in various delegations, but we have also transformed the method of the Federal Chamber's work into the method of the work of the Chamber of Republics and Provinces. Have we in this way practically revised the SFRY Constitution? The initiative for holding a vote of confidence lacks only one name for the delegation of a republic to be complete. Does the Federal Chamber then represent the working people, self-managing communities, and sociopolitical organizations as the Constitution states? I must say that the rounds of applause heard were similarly divided.

But, I would like to ask another question: Are only some delegates entitled to speak on behalf of the workers class and citizens of this country, is this right given only to Comrades Tesla and Grabar? Do others who think differently express only interests of bureaucratic elements in the socialist republics and provinces?! But here today, under the roof of this building on this very day—but only in a different room—we meet the proposition that in deciding on the motion of confidence we should take into consideration the specific weight of those who have initiated this proposal, starting with their national product and population.

Is this not the introduction of the majority principle according to population or national product?! This represents the final step that would revise the foundation of the AVNOJ [Anti-Fascist Council of Peoples Liberation of Yugoslavia] Yugoslavia as a community of equal peoples and nationalities. Can we introduce accords on the basis of national capitals instead of accords among socialist republics and provinces?

Where does this manipulation by invoking the SFRY Constitution lead to? This manipulation was perpetrated by the delegates from Croatia in their call for a vote of confidence in the FEC, when Article 346, Section 2, was cited and the FEC made responsible for the entire situation, but the part of the sentence that states "according to the rights and obligations of the federation" was omitted.

Today, I repeat quite definitely, today, Yugoslavia is facing difficult decisions. The situation—which we are about to enter and which will free many market levers—and the agreement with creditors will cause serious difficulties to many organizations and working people. The free price setting, free imports, and the free setting of rates of exchange will undoubtedly cause price rises. This is the fact we are facing.

Do we today agree to implement this difficult step?

Agreeing About the Crisis [subhead]

The FEC warns that these difficulties will not be easy. The decision must be joint or otherwise we will tomorrow find ourselves in a situation that our critics, who are calling for the market economy, which we also strive for, will ascribe the inevitable difficulties to the FEC only.

What is interesting is that, as far as this question is concerned, a new vote of confidence is to be held in 3 months time. This has been announced in the press by the Croatian Executive Council. There is more to it than just introducing into our system a category of a temporary government until September....

The agreement with creditors is not only an arrangement of the FEC but of Yugoslavia that is represented by this assembly. Decisions are made with the full agreement of all socialist republics and provinces. If there were another solution, the FEC would be ready to discuss it immediately.

If I am correctly informed, the Slovene and Croatian Assemblies support the agreement with the IMF. We are now blamed by some delegates from these two republics for having brought the country knocking on the door of the IMF again. The delegates from these republics today have an opportunity either to withdraw their support for this agreement, or to assume this responsibility together with us. Everything else is political and social demagoguery.

It is understandable that responsibility must also be assumed if the agreement is not accepted. Is the FEC also responsible for a possible delay in adopting the constitutional changes under the conditions when a different procedure is demanded for reaching an agreement on constitutional amendments, a procedure that has not been applied in our constitutional practice so far?

It is very interesting that one of our papers has already noted that if there were a vote of no confidence, we would be the only government whose program was accepted but did not receive a vote of confidence. What are we talking about, what kind of motives are we talking about? Are we only talking about doubts that the FEC is not prepared to realize the proposed program? A question of what should be done next is not asked....

If we want to live and work together, we must agree on a program for overcoming the crisis. If this FEC is to remain, let us during the reconstruction include in it the most able cadres from all socialist republics and provinces. But this is not enough. We must jointly look for the solutions to our problems with more understanding for the problems of others, more feeling for the country's joint problems, because inflation is not only a Serbian or Slovene problem. Inflation is a Yugoslav problem. No part of our country would enjoy a reputation abroad without the strengthening of Yugoslavia's international position and standing. In our country we must clarify, in a democratic way, controversial issues and the paths this country should follow.

The work of Yugoslav economic science on the reforms of the economic system conducted so far has demonstrated a high degree of unanimity. But if tomorrow we start to disagree and hinder the work of this or any other FEC instead of displaying cooperation and a constructive approach, the crisis will intensify. Similarly, if the minority hinders the work of the executive body of this assembly, to which this body is alone accountable, then the foundations of our Yugoslav community are in danger, and I hope we agree on this.

Polemics Following Milos Milosavljevic's Speech: "This Must Be Proved" [subhead]

Peter Hedzet: I understood the suspicious whisper I heard on my way to the rostrum. I think that we have been discussing things for a long time and that we want to convince ourselves that things are good, that they are more or less well founded and that tomorrow everything will be all right and without any problems.

The speech by Vice President Milosavljevic made me ask for the floor. First of all, I would like to dissociate myself from the assessment that, although we support the program that was shaped by the FEC, we do not want to assume responsibility for this program, by starting discussions on the FEC's work up to now, on the results and prospects of this society, and FEC's responsibility for its work. Roman Albreht is now in Slovenia, I do not know what he is doing....

Bozidar Matic (from the benches): He was the one that worked on the Law on Associated Labor....

Peter Hedzet: Even if he had worked on the Law on Associate Labor, he did not create the present problems!

Bozidar Matic (from the benches): They are here!

Peter Hedzet: This is your opinion! About 2 years ago, this FEC made a solemn declaration to this Assembly. I propose that in further constitutional discussions we scrap Article 397 or adopt it only as a guideline so that whoever assumes a task should try to follow it. After 2 years, the results do not show even the half of what was promised.

I am hurt, I am insulted, for if I say now—when we are assessing joint results, which are negligible in comparison with we set ourselves to do—that I support the government, would I be assuming the responsibility for this situation? Have I had an opportunity in the last 2 years to in any way contribute to a different situation?!

I ask Comrade Milosavljevic to answer this and to also explain the claims that the results of economic activities in Slovenia and Croatia, and other work organizations in Yugoslavia that had positive results, were the cause for an aggravation of our circumstances. We talk about democracy but at the same time have extremely a paternalistic attitude toward warnings and views expressed in this assembly and, through it, in this society.

The FEC is indeed not to blame for everything. I strongly believe that it would be unjust and unfair to pass this assessment. However, it is also incorrect to express opinions, views, and assessments that amount to something like this: That the FEC has taken only the measure to freeze the salaries and to check spending in order to put the situation in Yugoslavia in order, but that in this way it did not make any impression on the system.

If we talk about those who participated in spending, who did not respect federal laws and so forth, then I would like to hear the explanation of the assertion that somebody in the SR of Slovenia said that I did not have the right to talk about the interests of other parts of Yugoslavia, that in Slovenia social accords and self-managing agreements were not sufficiently aligned with the laws, that communal assemblies did not adopt decisions on those lines, and that the republican assembly did not pass the laws needed to regulate these matters in accordance with decisions adopted in this republic.

The delegates tell us that we are wasting time at sessions, that we are wasting time and money, that this society incurs expenses because of us, and we create the illusion that all problems will be resolved, but in fact nothing is being done.

I therefore stick to the view I have expressed and to the view that the present team will not secure successes in the future. We know that history will applaud this.

Milos Milosavljevic: I have no intention of presenting any new data or new economic analyses. You have enough of these.

But, let us not only talk about analyses; I would like to remind you that the question of the resignation of some FEC officials was raised only about 1 month after the FEC had been elected, and that it has been raised continuously since. Therefore, there is not much connection between this question and the analyses of business results for 1987. It would therefore be an illusion to discuss the analyses you have in front of you, and I hope that we at least agree on that. The FEC cannot be blamed for goods being returned because it is not a producer of either shoes or clothes.

The speech of some Slovene delegates, in which, if I correctly understood through my earphones, they said that we brought the country knocking on the door of the IMF again, made me say what I said about the agreement.

Third, as far as the responsibility of the Federation and the republics and provinces is concerned, I would like to illustrate the notion of responsibility with a more recent example. We are facing a very unpopular move of having to introduce nominal ceilings to spending. Without these nominal limits there will be no agreement with the IMF. When we proposed to the republics and provinces an alternative according to which everything would be left to their laws, and we would set only one nominal ceiling for total spending, this alternative was rejected at the meeting with the presidents of the republican and provincial executive councils, and later. This is indeed an unpopular move that should be left to the federal government.

This law is on the agenda today. We are immediately proposing the alternative (we have the FEC's approval for this because the FEC had already proposed this alternative) according to which we will set nominal ceilings for public expenditure in the republics and provinces. Let everything be sorted out by the republican and provincial laws. But, unpopular moves are left to the federal government so that the following day it could be fiercely "slapped."

We shall either make and adopt decisions in accordance with SFRY Constitution, or we shall lead the country into an even deeper crisis.

Daniel Pucko: I am asking for the floor just to ask Comrade Vice President Milosavljevic not to leave us insufficiently informed, because he had said that the government has offered the concepts of laws restricting expenditure that the presidents of the republican and provincial executive councils rejected. I would like to know whether or not all of them rejected it or who rejected it and who accepted it, because I think that it is very important that our people should know it. This is also significant because by deciding on these intervention laws we delegates in the SFRY Assembly are assuming a great responsibility.

Zlatko Grabar: I feel personally offended. I do not know how you feel after this speech of the vice president of the FEC. I cannot accept this unfounded insinuation that the comrade vice president addressed at my speech, especially considering that I do not posses the shorthand notes of the speech and it is therefore difficult for me to understand what he wanted to say. But I think that he said: "Do only some delegates in here have the right to speak on behalf of the people and the workers class, or do some other delegates have that right too?"

I demand an explanation. What does it mean?

First of all, today everybody spoke on behalf of the people and the workers. The same was done by the SAWP whose arguments I mentioned here. For instance, in the Committee for All-People's Defense it was said, on behalf of the nation and working people, that the FEC realized hardly any of its program tenets. In the Budget Committee, it was said that the greatest responsibility for the failure to implement measures and for economic difficulties should be borne by the FEC, and that responsibility should be put in specific rather than general terms. In the Committee for Internal Policy it was said that "one could hardly have trust in this kind of policy considering that it had not produced any results and that

it would therefore be difficult to have confidence in the executive-political center of this power." This is a quotation from the Committee's report.

In my view this is a political disqualification, a serious accusation, and a blow below the belt at the delegates' expense.

In view of everything mentioned above, I cannot congratulate the FEC on its results so far as some people who spoke before me have. I do not know whether the workers could do either.

Bogdan Tankosic: The delegate who spoke before me (Grabar) did not quote the report of the Committee for National Defense in full. May I ask that the report be cited in full, for a completely wrong picture is created if only some parts are taken from one report and some parts from another. A report should be seen as a whole. The discussion it contains is one thing, while conclusions that could be drawn from it are another.

[The following passage appears boxed within the body of the item]

Unbecoming Conduct [subhead]

The polemics between FEC Vice President Milosavljevic and several delegates made Omer Kurpejovic, president of the Federal Chamber, say the following: "I did not say this before in order not be understood as trying to influence the course of the discussion. But I must say as a delegate and as chairman of this session that I too did not understand the way Comrade Milos Milosavljevic addressed the delegates. Despite my personal respect for him, my respect for his contribution to our overall work and his attitude to the assembly, I felt that I needed to say this because in my view this kind of addressing the house by an official who is elected by it was not examplary.

I would particularly like to point out the unbecoming conduct of Comrade Matic (Bozidar Matic, member of FEC) who interrupted delegates and who joined the delegates in their applause. This is not appropriate, this cannot be done.

I must say this because I do not agree with this behavior and as chairman must protect the delegates I chair. But, to tell the truth, a number of delegates who came to the rostrum have also lost all sense of proportion."

This intervention by Omer Kurpejovic was greeted with applause.

Former Defense Minister Commended on Career

Presidency Hosts Farewell Lunch

AU2705103588 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 25 May 88 p 4

[TANJUG report: "Farewell Luncheon for Branko Mamula"]

[Text] Belgrade, 24 May—The SFRY Presidency, in its capacity as the highest leading and commanding organ of the SFRY Armed Forces, yesterday hosted a farewell luncheon for Branko Mamula, former federal secretary for national defense.

In a toast by its president, the SFRY Presidency expressed gratitude to Admiral Mamula and recognized his successful career as a federal secretary, and his contribution over many decades to the buildup of our Armed Forces and to their development and progress. It also recognized his contribution to perfecting the strategy and tactics of our defense and to the up-to-date organization, training, and readiness of our Army, as well as his permanent contribution to military theoretical thought.

Military Council Praises Mamula

LD2705213388 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1559 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Belgrade, May 27 (TANJUG)—The Yugoslav Armed Forces' Military Council today in Belgrade commended Retiring Defence Secretary Admiral of the Fleet Branko Mamula (67).

Mamula retired in mid-May after his four-year term in office ended.

At a meeting of the council, General Veljko Kadijevic, Yugoslavia's new defence secretary, thanked Admiral Mamula for his personal contribution to the development, reputation and combat readiness of the Yugoslav Armed Forces, to Yugoslav military doctrine and to the country's defence capability.

General Kadijevic pointed out that Admiral Mamula enjoyed high reputation among Yugoslavs, but that he was, for understandable reasons, also the target of criticism by opponents of Yugoslavia and its socialist self-management system.

General Kadijevic also said that the armed forces were an integral part of Yugoslav society, that they would not shut themselves into barracks and that they would continue to actively participate in the settlement of the country's crisis.

Slovene Daily Comments on Rumors on Putsch

AU2705134988 Ljubljana DELO in Slovene 24 May 88 p 1

["Topic of the Day" commentary by Tit Dobersek: "Psychological Putsch"]

[Text] Despite the official public announcement (or precisely because of it, because of its Delphic utterances, and above all because of the late reaction to the start of the rumors), the rumors about an intended "military coup" in Slovenia have not abated. If we consider the consequences that again divert attention from the most important points of our development, we may even say that, because of the crisis situation that provides a fertile soil for the spread of these rumors, they caused a kind of a psychological putsch in the public.

The rumors are in essence a vote of no confidence in the information system. Particularly in a state that adopted a constitutional right to being informed, we cannot afford the Latin luxury of keeping silent and remaining philosophers. This has operated against us both internally and externally in the past, if we remember the late and incomplete information on Kosovo, the visits of our delegations abroad, or the Chernobyl disaster. After all, we cannot remain information-wise like Robinson Crusoe in a world that is turning into a global village as regards communications, and we are reminded of this again by the foreign press displaying great interest in the latest event. This means that people will try to learn at second hand what they have not heard directly; and if anybody eventually proclaims this to be special war, he will have to accept the blame for starting it.

It would therefore be wrong to underestimate such rumors or to sweep them under the carpet, for we live in a time when politics is made up of small things, because we simply do not know how to tackle big ones. The responsibility of those who stand at the source of information and who can win the confidence of the public in one way only—with a clear word that will not admit ambiguities, even at the cost of encroaching on the "top secret" area—is therefore considerable.

MLADINA Questions Kucan on 'Witch-Hunt'

LD2605222488 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1306 GMT 26 May 88

[Text] Ljubljana, 26 May (TANJUG)—As part of its inquiry being held among Slovene officials, the MLADINA editorial board has put two questions to Milan Kucan, president of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the LC of Slovenia, and has published his replies in its latest issue.

Question: "A witch-hunt has been going on in Yugoslavia in recent months against the democratic processes developing in Slovenia. The outcome is an exacerbated political situation that is reflected also in contradictory and sometimes even intolerant public and private statements and reactions by Yugoslav politicians."

"I am surprised by your introductory statement that what is involved is a 'witch-hunt' against democratic processes," Milan Kucan writes in his reply to this question. "Nevertheless, your paper is building up a picture—insofar as I understand your editorial concept—of a specific emphasis on democratic openness contrasted with the differences in our country and in the outside world. For this reason I could not and would not wish to classify under this heading the various views, the more or less authoritative judgments and points of departure, with which the processes of democratization of political life in Slovenia and elsewhere in Yugoslavia are evaluated. That would deprive the debate of its dmeocratic legitimacy and would also be incorrect for the majority of people taking part in the discussion, who are basing their critical attitude on arguments and views, but with very little understanding of the situation and of the arguments."

"True, the political situation has become exacerbated," Kucan adds, "but this is not at all the result of this 'witch-hunt,' but primarily the result of economic and social issues. All these issues lack an envisaged solution and, it seems sometimes, they even lack the will to have them resolved. And this, like a nightmare, in addition to all other dimensions of the crisis, weighs heavily on the mind of the people and, of course, also on the political leaders throughout Yugoslavia.

Frustration, unsuccessful attempts to control the crisis, which were predominantly of an administrative nature, concern for the future, the burden of foreign currency and internal debts, unemployment and other serious social problems, and growing national contradictions cause undertainty, doubts, and openly articulated mistrust among our people, and especially among the young people, against those people and institutions who were unable to provide and carry out feasible concepts for solutions and for a faster all-around development, which will reduce the extent to which we are lagging behind the developed world."

"The easiest thing to do is to sail in charted waters. Technological and structural renewal of the economy, respect for realistic economic categories, and democratization of the decisionmaking process and of the development of socialist self-management, the opening to the world—all these things carry unknown risks and confrontations. Many people do not always feel ready enough to confront it. Is it because of the danger and the inevitability of their losing their social positions and positions of power? There is no doubt that the existing economic and social structure, including the climate it engenders, is one of the biggest obstacles. As far back as the 13th LCY Congress, Yugoslav Communists, including Slovene Communists, decided in our evaluation for a politically realistic option, that is, for the creation of a

materially and intellectually richer socialism. That implies the solution of the development problem, the affirmation of the market-planned economy, the full responsibility of self-management economic subjects for a rational management of social property. This is to be placed into an economic function, democratization coupled with greater creative initiative, the general influence of the people, the greater responsibility of the LC leader, the social role of the SAWP and assemblies and—based on this—democratization of all decisionmaking processes."

"The alternative of restoration, which allegedly threatens to emerge with the reaffirmation of commodity production, has never appeared to me to be particularly realistic. However, behind the failure of the implementation of the line of the development of socialist self-management, opted for, among others by the recent conference of the LC of Slovenia, there remains the possibility of restoration of non-self-management, a centralized, etatist, intellectually monolothic, uncreative management of social issues that would lead into egalitarianism, into the equality of poverty. I think it is quite clear which of the alternatives the Central Committee of the LC of Slovenia, its Presidium and, of course, I personally, are pressing for in all our activity. We do so firmly convinced that this is in the real interest of all parts of Yugoslavia, and of all its nations and nationalities. This direction alone ensures the material and other conditions for a comprehensive development and affirmation of all and everyone individually, their initiative, reputation and influence in the world, beginning with influence in Europe, our home. I am persuaded that this is so also by the mounting search and thinking elsewhere in Yugoslavia, for instance in the various commissions for the preparation of the concept of the reform of the economic system and economic policy, and also by many individual or group reflections, expressed most strongly through the nonconformist statements by the younger generations."

The second MLADINA question: "Do you personally think that there is a real danger of aggravated political relations in Yugoslavia being resolved in an undemocratic, repressive and unconstitutional manner?"

Milan Kucan writes: "I personally think that we must not believe in a real danger of that happening. There is hardly any need for aggravated political relations in the SFRY being resolved in an undemocratic, that is, in an unconstitutional manner. I am convinced that no attempt at providing this kind of solution can produce any long-term results, except that an incident provoked in this way would for a considerable time put off the unfreezing of existing and established relations, which in many places and in many respects are not socialist. Nor are there any serious intentions of doing that. We have democratic constitutions in all the republics and provinces. In their leaderships and also in all segments of the LC, we must work for the respect of constitutionality and legality, to which the LCY Central Committee devoted a session. I see no special reasons for unconstitutional, undemocratic solutions in this respect, especially if, with the LCY conference, we manage to create a politically more rational and ideologically clearer scope—for the necessary and useful changes to the Constitution, which the whole of Yugoslavia, and all the republics and provinces will accept as a contribution to the affirmation of a faster way out of the crisis and as a useful basis for the consolidation of equal and creative life together, leaving it to the discussions to search for a common concept of the new Constitution. With patient democratic debate, and not by arbitrary behavior and imposition, we can resolve the issues where differences of interest exist, caused as they are by the objective situation, for instance in the development, understanding and acceptance of the role of the market, and so on, although the alternatives, polarizations, and conflicts are real and understandable. I see no serious political force which, within the current Yugoslav realities, heeding the specific aspects of its own position, could make a move to resolve the contradictions in an unconstitutional manner and go on counting on the political legitimacy in the Yugoslav socialist multinational society," Milan Kucan concluded.

Candidate for Slovene Youth President Arrested

AU0106201488 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] In connection with the detention of Janez Jansa, youth activist and a candidate for the president of the Slovene Youth Organization, the Secretariat for Internal Affairs of Slovenia issued an official statement that says among other things:

Internal affairs organs searched Janez Jansa's apartment and workplace on 31 May. He is suspected of having committed the criminal act of betraying military secrets. A confidential military document was found. An order to detain Jansa was therefore issued, the Republican Secretariat for Internal Affairs of Slovenia says in its statement.

Sharp protests against Jansa's arrest were made by MLADINA, Radio Student, KATEDRA, and TRIBUNA.

Impact of FEC Measures in Kosovo Unknown

LD0106092488 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1433 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Pristina, 31 May (TANJUG)—It is not yet known in Kosovo what effect and difficulties will be caused by the latest FEC measures. Estimates should be made by provincial organs, institutions, and sociopolitical organizations that would then endorse their own measures for the implementation of the new "package" of the FEC, that is, for lessening the effect on standards of living.

Just yesterday the Executive Council of the Kosovo Assembly charged provincial organs and municipal executive councils with "examining" the effects on the economy, while the provincial committee for labor was entrusted with the task of examining their consequences on workers' standards of living. Not even the representatives of the provincial committee for labor could say anything specific at today's press conference on the consequences of, for instance, the application of the new law on personal incomes.

The only thing they could announce was that 18 economic and noneconomic branches could not fit into the latest "wages law" and that their employees would have to reduce the present incomes.

The organizations of these branches employ 20,580 workers.

According to some forecasts of the provincial committee for labor, the application of the law on financial reorganization would leave about 5,000 Kosovo workers out of a job, but there are still no concrete programs for how they will be distributed.

Although the exact number of organizations with uncovered losses is also not known, what is known is that workers in these collectives will receive a guaranteed personal income of 131,480 dinars. Personal incomes will be increased in the third quarter by 80 percent of the average in the economy, that is—according to the statistic data—[figure indistinct].

Loncar on Disarmament, Nonaligned Meeting

LD0106215688 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2121 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] Belgrade, June 1 (TANJUG)—The U.N. General Assembly's special session on disarmament began at a very favorable time for a world debate on war and peace—at the time of the superpowers' Moscow summit and immediately after the Non-Aligned Coordinating Bureau ministerial meeting in Havana, Yugoslav Foreign Secretary Budimir Loncar assessed today.

In a statement to Yugoslav TV this evening in New York, Loncar underscored that the special non-aligned ministerial meeting in Havana devoted to disarmament had the aim of formulating the non-aligned's stand at the U.N. session.

Loncar heads Yugoslavia's delegation to the General Assembly session.

The fact that the General Assembly session is being held during talks between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev causes different opinions, Loncar assessed.

Some consider that the session will be held in the shadow of the summit, while others consider that the moment is very favorable for a debate on disarmament because disarmament was the main topic in Moscow.

The appeal that the non-aligned sent to the world from Havana offers full support to the superpowers in their efforts for disarmament and at the same time sets out that the process can be consolidated in the world and secured only if all states participate in it equally, Loncar recalled.